DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 046 CG 014 440

AUTHOR Roy, Marjorie Brown
TITLE Women in Jail: Problems, Programs and Resources.
INSTITUTION Springfield YWCA, Inc., Mass.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Women's Educational Equity Act Program.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 167p.
AVAILABLE FROM EDC/WEEAP Distribution Center, 39 Chapel Street, Newton, MA 02160 ($3.50)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Role; *Citizen Participation; *Community Involvement; *Correctional Education; Correctional Rehabilitation; *Females; Prisoners; Program Descriptions; *Program Development; Public Agencies; Vocational Rehabilitation; Volunteers
IDENTIFIERS *Prison Reform

ABSTRACT

This manual is designed to assist those individuals or groups responsible for developing educational and vocational programs for women in jail. The first section identifies the needs and problems of women in jail, focussing on discrimination against poor women unable to afford bail, the nonviolent nature of women's crimes, and the inequity of jail programs and facilities. The second section offers a range of programmatic models from federally-funded to volunteer efforts. The programs are presented in terms of their particular emphases, i.e., health, education, children, vocational training, work/education release, recreation, alternatives, and aftercare: a list of resources for each type of program is also included. The third section describes the Female Offender Program in Hampden County, Massachusetts, including program design, staff training, accomplishments, problems, funding, and recommendations. A resource list of organizations across the country working on behalf of female offenders and criminal justice reform and a bibliography are also provided. (Author/HLM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188046

Women in Jail:
Problems, Programs, and Resources

by Marjorie Brown Roy

Springfield YWCA, Inc.
Springfield, Massachusetts

Women's Educational Equity Act Program
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Secretary

Mary F. Berry, Assistant Secretary for Education

Office of Education
Ernest L. Boyer, Commissioner

C6 014440

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janet Whittle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MAY 1 1980

-2-

Discrimination Prohibited: No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

Produced by the Springfield YWCA, Inc., under a grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, under the auspices of the Women's Educational Equity Act. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education or the Department, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Printed and distributed by Education Development Center, 1979, 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02160.

To My Parents

Florence and Gilbert Brown

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research for this book was funded by a grant from the Women's Educational Equity Act, United States Office of Education, to the YWCA of Springfield, Massachusetts.

The YWCA has backed my work with women offenders for over three years, struggling at times with values and philosophy, yet always encouraging collective growth. The cooperation and support of the YWCA staff and Board of Directors are gratefully acknowledged.

Many people across the country freely shared program information, offering encouragement and support for the publication of this research. To all of you, I express my appreciation.

Special thanks go to my fellow advocates in Springfield, whose faith and encouragement stimulated my research; challenging each other's ideas, we clarified our own. Among those special people are: Stelle Fontaine, Joyce Rubin, Nancy Weiner, Claudia Days, Roz Canter, Carolyn Morell, and Darlene Mickiewicz.

Also, I wish to acknowledge the very helpful, patient work of my assistant, Peggy Brooks, who typed untold letters, notes, and the manuscript itself repeatedly, while offering caring support.

A very special thanks goes to the women offenders and ex-offenders I have worked with in the last few years, who shared their thoughts, fears, frustrations, anger, hopes, and dreams with me. Thank you for helping me learn, and for giving me your trust.

Contents

Introduction 1

1. Problem 5

Jailing 6

A Jail Is Not a Prison 7
Women's Prison vs. Women's Jails 7
Jail Reform 8
Historical Treatment of Women Offenders 11
Women and Crime 14
Administration of Justice 21

Warehousing 26

Physical Facilities 27
Correctional Staff 31
Social Service Programs 35

Punishing 41

Problems for Incarcerated People 42
Unique Problems for Women in Jail 45
Children 45
Health Problems 47
Stigmas: Jobs and Training 48
Powerlessness 49
Pretrial: Presumed Innocent 50

2. Programs 55

Rehabilitating 56

Self-Esteem 57
Intake and Needs Assessment 61
Resources 65
Health 66
Resources 69
Children 70
Resources 73
Education 74
Resources 81
Vocational Programs 84
Resources 88
Recreation 89
Resources 93

Work/Education Release 94
Resources 96
Alternatives to Incarceration 97
Resources 100
Aftercare 102
Resources 105

Barriers to Rehabilitation 106

Resources 110

Community Involvement 111

Resources 116

3. Model Project: Female Offender Program, Springfield, Mass. . . 117

Background 118

Program Design 122

Staff Training 125

Program Accomplishments 126

Problems 129

Funding and Budgets 131

Recommendations 132

4. Resources 135

5. Bibliography 149

6. A Final Note 163

Introduction

As I first conceived this book on women in jails, I envisioned researching in the purely objective scientific method of physics or chemistry -- gathering statistics, case histories, program designs as one would study molecules or compounds.

However, I quickly realized the value-free approach is impossible, and undesirable, to apply to criminal justice. We cannot separate what is from what ought to be. We cannot keep the moral issues, social inequities, subjective interpretations out of social science research. We all come to our work with certain prejudices, values, and religious convictions, which color the direction of our research. We set out to look for certain things.

In 1893, Cesare Lombroso was among the first to study female criminals, and he concluded that the concept of "born criminal" that he had developed by studying male offenders was rare among women. Lombroso tried to correlate physical size, sexual development, etc., with criminal behavior, but could find no correlation among women criminals.

Though women offenders may not share common physical traits, they do suffer common problems of poverty, unemployment, broken homes, single parenting, and drug abuse. For most women offenders, poverty is a major correlate of crime. They "offend" society's rules because this culture is not egalitarian, and they are denied access to middle-class opportunities. They have not purposely set out to break laws, but are forced to respond counterculturally to survive. Half the crimes committed by women are victimless and economically inspired. With a planned policy of unemployment, contrasted against the Protestant ethic "bootstraps" mentality of the middle class, women offenders find themselves and their children baited with a materialistic culture to which they are denied normal access.

The time has come to pay more attention to the social conditions precipitating criminal actions, to put less blame on the criminal and more on the culture. Said Angela Davis, "Maybe the real criminals are not the people who populate the prisons ... but those who have stolen the wealth of the world from the people."

The churches, schools, business communities, and criminal justice system share the challenge to develop meaningful programs within and outside the jail walls, to deinstitutionalize as many women as possible, and to collectively reintegrate jailed women back to their home communities. No one can reintegrate into a social vacuum; it's a two-way street.

Social stigmas and labels that peg ex-offenders as pariahs only serve to force them back to crime. Subjected to social rejection and lacking new social connections and resources, the ex-offender has few options except to return to the lifestyle of the streets.

Women offenders need caring people on the outside to help with the transition, just as any of us need loving friends and allies during similar crisis situations such as divorce, illness, or bereavement.

Christ said to his disciples, "Love one another as I have loved you" (John 15:12). It is a difficult charge. It is easy to love and care about those who are like us; we can relate to their feelings, needs, problems, for they reflect our own. It is hard to love those who are not a reflection of our own lives; we don't know what they fear, what they need, the drudgery of their day-to-day lives. Most professionals in social service haven't experienced the pain of poverty, compounded by the heartache of broken homes and shattered dreams.

Yet, all of us share a common need: to love and be loved. It is basic to all people across all racial, class, economic, and religious backgrounds. To understand women in jails, one must foster a genuine concern for them -- not as a self-righteous "do-gooder" but as one <u>equal</u> human being to another.

Too many jailers have become jaded to all the things that can't be done, diagnosing too many inmates as beyond help. John Watkins, Warden of the Draper Correctional Center in Elmore, Alabama, tells of a kitchen man whose English was horrible, and whose education was minimal. He didn't know psychoanalysis from anthropology, but he could relate to inmates in ways other people couldn't. He sincerely cared about the inmates, and they trusted him.

Women in jails have received far too little attention from researchers, social workers, jailers, or local communities. Few of the 4,000 jails in this country treat women equitably, and too many still impose inhumane conditions on female inmates -- crowded, squalid cells, inadequate health care for pregnant women, callous treatment of accused inmates, insensitive visiting rules, sexual abuse, etc. Inmate advocacy and jail reform are long overdue. It is not a criminal justice program solely; the community shares the responsibility to effect change.

The focus of this book is clearly on community involvement to develop educational/vocational programs for women. Meaningful jobs that pay a decent wage are the strongest weapons against crime. However, programming in these areas cannot be separated from other needs -- children and effective parenting, health, socialization skills, self-esteem, use of leisure time, financial planning, etc. We are dealing with total people, women who simultaneously play roles as mothers, lovers, breadwinners, family accountants. They are infinitely variable and complex.

I have divided this book into three subject areas. The first section describes the needs and problems of women in jail: discrimination against poor women who are jailed before trial because they can't raise bail; the nonviolent nature of women's crimes; the inequity of jail programs and facilities; and the special problems of women. We must understand the full scope of the problems if we are to lobby for meaningful reform. With facts to counteract the prevailing myths, we stand a fighting chance.

I have also included relevant legal references, class action suits brought to court and won on behalf of jailed women. Though legal action is slow, often taking years, it may be the only recourse in some less enlightened communities.

The second section offers a range of programmatic models, in an effort to show some of what is being tried by allies of pretrial and sentenced women in jails of various sizes across the country.

The programs described range from federally funded to purely volunteer efforts. I have a personal preference for those programs with heavy volunteer input, for their involvement outlasts the whims of federal legislation. Volunteer input also enhances community consciousness raising, helping people outside to understand the jail system. Building a caring community is the basis for ultimately abolishing jails, a logical response for serious reformers.

Volunteers outside enjoy the enviable position of freedom to speak up without jeopardizing their jobs. This is, unfortunately, an inherent problem for jail employees. Citizen advocates are free to risk, to gamble, to go out on a limb for a woman because they care about her. This I have found so exciting: seeing dedicated women outside joining hands with women inside to effect institutional change.

Because of the lack of documentation regarding women in jails, many reformers have felt alone in their work. I have communicated with concerned men and women across the country who have asked for names and addresses of other programs confronting similar problems. They have been relieved to find others with whom they can share questions, frustrations, anger, and yes, even hope!

Though some jails have been successful in getting their local governments to fund women's programs, most still rely on volunteers or federal funding, primarily through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). Government grants are, at best, unpredictable; their sporadic availability denies the responsibility of the local community. The YWCA, Junior League, Council of Churches, women's clubs, and business organizations need to join county jails in the pursuit of funds. United Way allocations rarely treat women's programs equally with men's, and courageous community leaders need to address this money problem head on. Jail reform requires hell raising as well as fund raising on behalf of women inmates.

It would be idealistic to propose that every community should, or could, institute every kind of program described in this book. The diversity of programming models has been offered to show you a range of ideas. As you explore the possibilities in your local jail, take into consideration your group's personality and interests, balanced against the political climate and resources of your community.

The third section of this book describes the Female Offender Program in Hampden County, Massachusetts, which I helped to develop over two years ago. I've given some subjective comments on our experiences in starting and running a new women's program in jail.

In Springfield, Massachusetts, we were fortunate to have a sensitive sheriff who was willing to gamble on me and the Springfield YWCA with whom I was associated, to develop a comprehensive, collaborated women's program. We still have issues on which we don't agree, but a trusting relationship has developed that tolerates conflicting opinions.

Programs for women would never have been developed without the concern of the Sheriff, Michael J. Ashe, and Deputy Master of Human Services, J. John Ashe. Both have bravely opened the Hampden County Jail up to public scrutiny, to try to make that once-archaic institution more humane, more bearable for women (and men) inmates.

There are two other people who deserve special credit -- John Lum and John Armore. I had the pleasure of meeting both several years ago, and their enthusiasm for criminal justice reform was contagious. They encouraged me to expand my mind, question and challenge the way things are.

I owe many of the ideas incorporated into this book to many people: friends, family, professional colleagues, and especially my husband, Harold O. Roy. His sensitivity, intellect and love are anchors in an unjust world that isn't fair, that endows some and abuses many. We struggle on in guarded optimism.

Marge Brown Roy
July 10, 1977.

1. Problems

Just as women in general were discouraged from decrying their limited role out of the belief that they were, after all, advantaged, so, too, were female offenders who, in spite of their exclusion from rehabilitation programs, were assured that they were the favored client of the criminal justice system.

Although recognizing that, in some respects, they have been treated more leniently within the system, the "pedestal factor" has seldom operated to the advantage of women in the criminal justice system.

Laura Crites, *The Female Offender*

Jailing

The paucity of data on the female offender is only slightly less disturbing than the lack of concern. Neither the criminal justice system nor the public even knows who the female offender is, much less what her needs and problems are.

-- District of Columbia Commission on
the Status of Women

Women derive one major benefit from being ignored by the System: proportionately fewer of them are arrested than men and an even smaller proportion are convicted and incarcerated.

-- Marilyn Haft, *Clearinghouse Review*

A Jail Is Not a Prison

A jail is *not* a prison. Both jails and prisons incarcerate people, evoking an institutional identity in the public mind. This identity is illusionary; the important differences between the functions of jails and prisons outnumber the superficial similar functions of detention.

Jails house both the accused and the convicted: over 50% of the jailed population consists of pretrial detainees and many of the rest are misdemeanants. Prisons hold convicted felons almost exclusively: *no untried people go to prisons.*

Jails are the intake point for the entire criminal justice system, while prisons are, in a sense, the terminal point. This sequential relationship is manifested in the nationwide presence of approximately 4,000 jails, but ten times *fewer* prisons. Though most people lump both types of institutions together the differences mandate special considerations. Jails may be called Houses of Correction, Houses of Detention, or County Prisons, but any correctional institution that houses adult offenders for 48 hours to two years may be considered a jail.

There are more inmates in county and municipal jails than in state and federal prisons combined. According to Professor Hans Mattick, "One could speculate that *jails hold from 3-4 million people annually* -- perhaps 35 times the number handled by all state and federal prisons."[1] Women comprise about 5% of the total jail population, seemingly insignificant until one considers that nearly 200,000 women are incarcerated in jails each year.

In many jails, women are locked in the cells all day, because no other provision has been made for them. Recreational, educational, and vocational services that are offered to men may not be available to women in jail because of lack of supervision, inadequate facilities, the rampant fear of mixing men and women, the small number of women, frequent turnover, cost, and security risks. With few exceptions, jails collect only the most basic information on incarcerated females. With little information on each woman's background and needs, effective programs cannot be planned for her.

Women's Prisons vs. Women's Jails

A sharp distinction exists between women's prisons and jail facilities for women. By and large, the descriptions of the inequities in programs and treatment of women offenders more aptly describe the situation in jails rather than prisons, especially those jails that are administratively and physically a part of a primarily male institution.[2] While women in jails have probably been the most neglected inmate population, women in prisons have probably experienced more reform than their male counterparts.

---

[1] Ronald Goldfarb, *Jails: The Ultimate Ghetto*, p. 14, from Daniel Glaser's *Handbook in Criminology*, "The Contemporary Jails," p. 47.

[2] Ruth Glick, *National Study of Women's Correctional Programs*, p. 190.

As an indictment against jail conditions, suicide claims ten times more inmates in jails than in prisons.

Women's prisons are probably the least repressive of all the correctional institutions. The women's prison is not usually as large or as heavily oriented toward security and surveillance as men's institutions. The architecture and security arrangements of women's prisons suggest a greater emphasis on rehabilitation, with fewer gun towers, double fences, and concrete walls. The treatment orientation is evident in the layout of the physical plant, innovative programs, the relaxed dress code, and the relative harmony between security and social work staffs.[1]

Unfortunately, despite the more humanistic environment for women, incarceration in a state prison implies remoteness from family and friends. Eight states[2] do not maintain any institution for female felons, considering it uneconomical and preferring to "board" women in neighboring state prisons. When a woman is incarcerated in a prison many miles from her home, she may have difficulty keeping track of her children, in communicating with her lawyer during any postconviction legal action, and in gaining access to her parole board. Many states have recognized the problems of prison remoteness, and tried to bridge the gap through the development of local halfway houses and prerelease centers in the growing movement toward more community-based correctional institutions.

Jail Reform

Though in many ways, jails are ripe for reform, the biggest obstacle is lack of accountability to a higher, or central, system. Each jail is run independently: approximately 80% are county facilities, with the rest run by local municipal governments. Prisons are controlled by centralized state or federal bureaucracies. Regulations governing jails are an anachronistic mishmash; those governing prisons characteristically reflect centralized administration and professional management.

To date, only five states[3] directly control jails in their jurisdiction, although others have recognized the need for technical assistance. Dr. Edith Elisabeth Flynn concluded that *"it is precisely this phenomenon of autonomous, local control that has been consistently and invariably identified as the chief obstacle to jail reform.* As a result of the independent manner in which jails are administered, the majority suffer from perennial lack of funding, from physical neglect, from absence of any kind of program."[4]

---

[1] Jails are more likely to reflect a high custody orientation. This must be addressed in implementing programs, inasmuch as the philosophy of the unit may be an important key to a program's success or failure.

[2] Idaho, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, Montana, North Dakota, Wyoming, and Hawaii.

[3] Rhode Island, Delaware, Connecticut, Alaska, and Vermont.

[4] Edith Elisabeth Flynn, "Jails and Criminal Justice," p. 59.

Though the development of uniform standards is an important step toward reform of these archaic institutions, there presently exists no manner in which to enforce such standards. Regionalization of jail facilities and services may be a solution, but underlying any consideration is *the question of control;* often sheriffs are politicians first, and correctional administrators second.

Jail reform measures have been few in number. The low visibility and insignificant threat in society posed by women in jails have kept their needs and problems hidden from public view.

Women don't stage riots in jails, and only rarely in prisons. Jail reforms, and indeed public and official interest in offenders, are strongly influenced by the amount of disruption and violence that occurs inside the institutions. Inmates may need to riot, to destroy property, to endanger the lives of guards and fellow inmates, or to submit a list of demands for reforming the institutions, before they are likely to receive much attention.[1]

While male inmates of state and federal prisons, as well as of local jails, have staged riots in the past (particularly in the growing political awareness of prisoners during the 1960s and early 70s), the number of riots in women's prisons, much less women's jails, have been almost nonexistent.

Women seem to respond passively to their incarceration, demanding little and getting nothing. Riots in men's institutions have precipitated increased public awareness, the formation of investigatory committees, and acknowledgment by correctional officials that reform is needed, while women in jails have remained quiet to their own needs.

Jails may be the place where women offenders' needs can best be met, hopefully without riots or legal action. Their needs are inherently community based, potentially minimizing the disruption and maximizing the reintegration.

Other advantages to implementing programs on the county jail level include:

* Jails hold many first offenders, and intensive rehabilitation for misdemeants is thought by many judicial authorities to be where we "win or lose" the war on crime.[2] Graduation from victimless to more serious crimes is clearly indicated in offense patterns.

---

[1] Rita James Simon, "Contemporary Women and Crime," p. 64.

[2] Susan Katzenelson (*The Female Defendant in Washington, D.C.*, p. iii) has proposed that the offense patterns of women seem to change with age: victimless crimes (mainly prostitution) peak at the younger ages (21-25); property crimes (i.e., larceny) peaks in the early-mid thirties; and violent crimes (assault) are usually highest in the older age group.

* The downtown location of many jails (versus the remote locale of state prisons) is conducive to the involvement of community agencies, training facilities, schools, and volunteers. Jobs, a major key to rehabilitation,[1] may be accessible via public transportation. This community linkage indicates a continuity of services to pretrial, sentenced, and paroled offenders.

* The short sentences of most offenders (usually under two years) place rehabilitation efforts in the immediate future. A woman facing a ten-year prison sentence is hard pressed to see the usefulness of completing her education or learning a marketable skill, if she won't be able to apply any of that to the outside world for many years.

* Because the women's population in jails is small, high-impact counseling is feasible. Staff or volunteers can work intensively with each woman over several months; women in jails are less apt to get lost in the numbers shuffle of big state prisons.

* The majority of women in jails are young[2] and vocational training and education fit into normal cultural patterns. Training for a new vocation at 35 is as difficult for a woman offender as it is for any person switching careers at mid-life.

This book is addressed to the problems of women in jails. Logically, then, it is addressed to the problems of poor women in jails. Their unique situation subsumes both their femaleness and their impoverishment.

The dual focuses of women and jails transcend any simple statistical abstraction -- they cry out for attention to the 200,000 individual human beings, many mothers, mostly poor, all fully capable of the entire range of the human experience, from the depths of angry despair to the heights of unselfish love.

Jack Newfield calls jails "The Ultimate Ghetto," saying: "If we as a nation are at all serious about the problems of crime, the place to start dealing with it is where the identifiable criminals are -- in the jails. Ramsey Clark has justly called them 'factories of crime.' As long as we treat law-breakers like garbage to be dumped far enough away so there is no smell, as long as we use jails for punishment instead of rehabilitation, then the crime rate will continue to soar and none of us will feel safe."[3]

---

[1] Unemployment has been consistently linked as a correlate of crime, often estimated as high as 70% among women.

[2] The ABA *Women in Detention and Statewide Jail Standards* (p. 4) reported that the female inmate population in the nation's jails is predominantly young, 75% under 30 years of age. Of a prisoner sample of 2,338, 24% were 17-22 years of age, 51% were between 22 and 30, 19% were 30-40, and 7% were age 40 and over.

[3] Jack Newfield, *Bread and Roses, Too*, p. 333.

Historical Treatment of Women Offenders

As a place of detention and safekeeping of the accused for trial, the jail can be traced to the earliest forms of civilization, when it made its debut in the form of murky dungeons, abysmal pits, unscalable precipices, strong poles or trees, and suspended cages in which hapless prisoners were kept.[1] King Henry II of England was among the first to order the construction of a jail, to keep the accused from escaping to the woods and hiding. Despite his directive, few jails were built until the eighteenth century.[2] The earliest jails in this country date back to 1632 (Boston) and 1682 (Philadelphia), when "people pens" were constructed to punish vagrants and other minor offenders.[3]

In the United States, the majority of the jails are abominably old. An estimated 25,000 jail cells (and about the same number of prison cells) were built over a half-century ago, and the price tag for replacement is one billion, 500 million dollars.[4] *In 47 jails across the country (in 21 states), toilets are not available in the cells, and offenders continue to use buckets as they did in the nineteenth century.*[5]

Historically, the punishment of criminals has been swift and brutal, ranging from exile to execution, and from mechanical torture to mutilation. Female criminals have suffered equally with men in most respects, but have also endured rampant sexual abuse (by both male guards and male prisoners) and the enforced separation (often lifelong) from their children.

Change comes slowly. The European Age of Enlightenment in the mid-eighteenth century saw writers such as Alexis de Tocqueville, Caesare Bonesana, and Marchese di Becarria begin to explore the bestiality foisted on men and women in prison.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, reform for conditions for women began with Elizabeth Fry, a "Quaker who took her Christianity seriously."[6] Revolted by the squalor in which women prisoners lived at Newgate Prison (London), she enlisted other Quaker volunteers to work with

---

[1] Edith E. Flynn, "Jails and Criminal Justice," p. 49.

[2] Janet Harris, *Crisis in Corrections*, p. 51.

[3] Hans Mattick, "Contemporary Jails," p. 777.

[4] William Nagel, *The New Red Barn*, p. 149.

[5] *1970 National Jail Census*, p. 4.

[6] Janet Harris, *Crisis in Corrections*, p. 61.

the women every day. Mrs. Fry believed in society's duty to reform, and not to degrade, its imprisoned criminals. Her volunteers brought food and clothing into the prisons and set up educational and work programs. The insights of this quiet Quaker and determined Englishwoman instigated penal reform for women throughout the British Isles and continental Europe. Her message was clear: harsh treatment for minor offenders bred resentment and recidivism, and seldom rehabilitated.

Correctional administrators had at first believed the quiet Mrs. Fry had a soft heart, but not a practical mind as she openly mingled with women prisoners in the cramped, squalid quarters. But her love and genuine concern for their welfare was contagious. As she gave of herself to them, the women prisoners in those barbaric institutions began to trust her. She involved them in program planning for educational programs for themselves and their children -- a rather far-sighted gesture, since most correctional systems in this country still fail to involve women inmates in program planning. Elizabeth Fry's work indicated an important variable in working with offenders -- caring about them as people. It's not enough to just offer programs: *the quality and dedication of the staff running those programs is the important difference in programs that "work" versus those that don't.*

The work of reformers such as Mrs. Fry also had impact in America; after the Civil War, Quaker sensibilities urged a different response to criminal behavior, away from repression, force, and revenge alone.[1] The burgeoning Industrial Revolution and a desire by prison officials to show a profit coincided with the humanistic focus of the Quakers, bringing prisoners out of solitary confinement[2] into group workshops during the day. This philosophy of corrections was called the Auburn System (developed in New York State) and became the prevailing treatment mode.

Though correctional reform was moving in the direction of somewhat more humane treatment of prisoners, it was not until 1873 that a separate women's prison was built in the United States. Up to that time, men and women had been housed collectively -- a system that led to rampant sexual abuse of women.

The Indiana Reform Institution for Women, built out of a concern about sexual promiscuity with a mixed inmate population, embraced the revolutionary notion that women criminals should be rehabilitated rather than punished. The institution was originally developed without minimum or maximum sentences, because women were considered more easily rehabil-

---

[1] William Nagel, *The New Red Barn*, p. 6.

[2] Solitary confinement was widely used as punishment under the Eastern Penitentiary System in the United States. Prisoners were left alone in their cells with only a bible, and occasional visits from a spiritual advisor. Solitary confinement dates back to the reign of Constantine, being used by the church in punishing errant clerics. Unfortunately, the "silent system" often drove the prisoners insane.

itated. Unfortunately, rehabilitation programs failed to materialize, and the allegedly flexible sentencing policies became extended periods of unproductive incarceration.[1]

From the beginning, women's prisons espoused educational aims, primarily social education. The humanistic focus of the first women's prison (markedly different from the security orientation of men's prisons) was later replicated in other states, including Massachusetts's Framingham State Prison and New York's Westfield Farm. Visitors to women's prisons today will immediately see the stark contrast to jail facilities for women. *Women's prisons were designed and built to incarcerate women; the jails were designed to hold male inmates, with women an afterthought to construction.*

While conditions for women in prison have improved and were conceived with a humanistic perspective, the conditions for women in jails remain at nineteenth-century levels of neglect, abuse, and disregard for their special needs. The jails were never designed to house women in quarters equal to those provided for men, much less establish programs to meet their unique needs.

Women have historically been neglected in terms of equitable treatment as well as data collection on their needs. Historical surveys lend little information on women offenders, and even current texts present only sketchy profiles.

Until 1970, studies of jails in the United States were almost nonexistent. *The National Jail Census* of 1970 was the first attempt to conduct even basic statistical research into conditions of the facilities. The *National Jail Census* was designed primarily to obtain facts on the state of the jails, and in 1972 the *National Survey of Inmates of Local Jails* was the first real attempt to focus on the inmates and their backgrounds. Despite its objectives, even the 1972 study failed to offer substantive information on the women in jails. The 1967 comprehensive study on the problems of crime and corrections in the United States, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice *(The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society)*, did not include a single paragraph on the female offender, nor could any such material be found in its nine Supportive Task Force Reports. In 1973, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Task Force Report on Corrections*, allocated a grand total of 3-1/2 pages to an explanation of women's special problems, out of the entire 636-page document.

---

[1] Freda Adler, *Sisters in Crime: The Rise of the New Female Criminal*, p. 231.

Women and Crime

Although males continue to commit the greater number of recordable crimes, women are committing some kinds of crimes at rates as high as three or four times faster.[1] Property offenses reflect the greatest increases, from 8.46% of all arrests of women in 1953, to 26.3% in 1976. This increase may be attributed to women's increased economic needs as property offenders show a consistently high rate of unemployment (74%).[2]

Property offenses such as larceny rank first in terms of frequency, while narcotic offenses rank sixth. Prostitution reflects only 3% of all female arrests. The statistics effectively shatter the myth that all women offenders are prostitutes.

Although in actual numbers, female crime remains much lower than male crime,[3] current statistics show that the proportion of women in crime is higher than any other time since the end of World War II. The war put different demands on women, with hundreds of thousands working at "men's" jobs. The emancipation of women was reflected in the increases of crimes against property, with greater opportunity for larceny in particular. After World War II, as men returned to the jobs and women went back to the home, the statistics on women's crime reflected a diminished level of female arrests. In countries that were neutral during the war (i.e., Switzerland, Holland, the Netherlands), the social roles did not change for women, and their arrest rate remained constant during the war years.

Many are blaming the increase in female arrests to the Women's Liberation Movement, clinging to the common notion that it's not in women's natures to commit crimes.

However, Otto Pollack in his classic study *The Criminality of Women* proposes that women are just as prone to criminal behavior as men, but the manifestation makes their crimes more difficult to detect and convict than men's more overt type of crimes.[4] Women are more inclined to be secretive than men. They are taught by the culture to hide things like abortions, their menstrual periods, pregnancy, and because of their physical makeup, can hide their sexual feelings.

---

[1] In the ten-year period from 1960-1970, arrests for females for serious crimes increased 202% for females, as against 70% for males (nearly 3 times as fast). In the five-year period from 1967-72, arrests of females for serious crimes increased 72% for females, as against 18% for males (4 times as fast). During the thirteen-year period 1960-73, arrests for "major crimes" by males increased 87.9%, while arrests for females jumped 277.9%.

[2] Susan Katzenelson, *Female Defendants in Washington, D.C.*, pp. iii & 15.

[3] One in 6.5 arrests is a woman; one in 9 convictions is a woman, and one in 30 of those sentenced to prison is a woman.

[4] Otto Pollack, *The Criminality of Women*, p. 56.

This concealment factor is probably based on the lesser physical strength of women, combined with the cultural expectations of hiding sexuality or aggressiveness. Like other oppressed classes, women may share the same aspirations as men, but lacking direct means, have utilized ploys, ruses, and deviousness.[1] When Oliver Goldsmith wrote, "She stoops to conquer," he was perhaps summing up the method and the madness of women.

The nature of women's crimes has reflected this concealment factor. Shoplifting is common to women, and is indicative of women being socially-conditioned consumers.

Marie Bertrand reports that studies in France, Canada, Belgium, and the United States (1963-1965) revealed that women are very often (and more than their sex ratio would indicate) arrested and convicted for offenses against property that call for a somewhat indirect way of proceeding: fraud, forgery, false pretense, etc.[2]

Though violence is not commonly considered typical of women, the manner in which women murder has been described by Gerald Sparrow as reflective of their secretive natures. Murder by poison is seen by him and others as a natural outgrowth of women's tendency and socially-conditioned pattern to conceal.[3]

Though the media publicizes females robbing banks, and also committing armed robberies, mugging, loan-sharking operations, extortion, murders, and a wide variety of other aggressive, violence-oriented crimes, the degree of violent crimes by women has remained fairly stable over the last two decades (according to the FBI's *Uniform Crime Reports*, 1953-1976) -- 2.2% of all female arrests in 1953 vs. 3% in 1976. Homicides by women actually dropped 4.5% in the U.S. between 1964 and 1970. Tom Joyce, an ex-officio member of the National Resource Center on Women Offenders, has warned that the distorted image of increasingly violent and dangerous women offenders may result in tightened security in women's jails, rather than developing more appropriate alternative programs.[4]

The British scene has many similarities with the American. The belief that women's participation in crime, especially crimes of violence, has increased is much greater than the data substantiate. Women in England, as in the U.S., are more likely to engage in theft and fraud than they

---

[1] Freda Adler, *Sisters in Crime*, p. 11; and Otto Pollack, *The Criminality of Women*, pp. 8-12.

[2] Marie Bertrand, *Self-Image and Social Representation*, p. 87.

[3] Gerald Sparrow, *Women Who Murder*, p. 8.

[4] Jill Ruckelshaus, *To Form a More Perfect Union: Justice for American Women*, p. 293.

are in crimes of violence.[1] Female offenders in Russia are similarly more inclined toward crimes against property than against persons.[2]

An unpublished report for the Elizabeth Fry Society of Toronto argues that "the great bulk of those who are convicted of indictable offenses have education below the high school level and that generally stated, the Women's Liberation Movement has had little impact on these groups."[3] Margery Velimesis, former director of the Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders, shares this view. "Because most women in jail are not politicized and are traditionalist in their life viewpoint, I believe the growing rates of crimes against persons committed by women indicates the growing stress placed upon women who must make their own way.[4]

Assata Shakur, an articulate young black woman incarcerated at Riker's Island, Women's House of Detention in New York, said in an interview, "I think a lot of positive things are the result of the Women's Liberation Movement. I think, however, that the WLM has not expanded to include working-class women and Third World Women. We must understand, however, that this is because of many reasons, some of which include lack of understanding, communication, and awareness of each other on both sides; the resolution of these might accomplish the togetherness needed."[5]

Inasmuch as many are arguing that the typical female offender is poor, undereducated, and unskilled, and that the Women's Liberation Movement has been primarily a white, middle-class "struggle," to blame female criminality on feminism is a mistake.

Something much more basic seems to be operating here, and that is economics. The *1972 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails* indicated that poverty is a major correlate of crime. Nearly 50% of all jail inmates failed to earn $1,999 per year prior to incarceration. The 1972 U.S. median income of $9,255 was exceeded by only 10% of the inmates.[6]

A woman who is unmarried, unemployed, poor, and out of luck does not contemplate the "theoretical niceties" of her socioeconomic situation. She does not deliberately set out to break laws, but deals pragmatically with the realities of her situation and takes what she can, when she can get it. With few legitimate avenues for making money, criminal activity becomes a logical survival response. Though 80% of the women in jails

---

[1] Rita James Simon, *Women and Crime*, p. 103.

[2] Margery Velimesis, "The Female Offender," pp. 4-5, from Serbrjakova, "Criminological Characteristics of Female Offenders Based on a Study of Inmates of the ITK," 1971, pp. 3-16.

[3] "Crimes by Women Are on the Rise All Over the World," *U.S. News & World Report*, December 22, 1975, p. 50.

[4] Margery Velimesis, "Women in County Jails and Prisons," pp. 4-5.

[5] *Off Our Backs*, January/February 1976, p. 4.

[6] *Survey of Inmates of Local Jails*, p. 4.

have dependent children, less than 25% are married.[1] Their financial struggle is not one for self-expression, independence of "pin money"; it is a matter of survival. To the hard-core unemployed, locked out of the predominant economic system, survival is a matter of maximizing the available opportunities, a succession of short-term gains, balanced against the possibility of long-term losses. They exploit the tiny area of resources available to them.

This lack of a legitimate means of making an income was a motivating factor to commit a crime for a significant number of women in jails. Women who are poor, undereducated, and unskilled often turn to larceny, prostitution, and passing bad checks as a means to support themselves and their children.

The use of narcotics further complicates the problem; as it is used to numb the pain of poverty and misery of hopelessness, it cements women into further criminal activities. A larger proportion of charges against women offenders are drug related.

Though the United States Supreme Court ruled in 1962 (*Robinson* v. *California)* that the status of addiction, in itself, cannot be punished as a crime,[2] the ruling is interpreted by social class.

The affluent finance their drug habits through "legal" channels, with synthetic narcotics prescribed by doctors. A middle-class housewife with a cabinet full of drugs -- to wake up, to pep up, to slow down, to sleep, to diet -- is not considered a "junkie" by society. Her inability to cope with the frustrations of life is diagnosed as "depression" or "nervous tension" or some other acceptable psychological term. On the other hand, the typical "street" addict is not treated as having emotional problems, but as a criminal. The difference seems to lie in having the money to legitimize the habit.

Victimless crimes such as addiction occupy an enormous amount of the criminal justice system's resources -- *50% of the people in jail are charged with victimless crimes*. Because such activities have been deemed "illegal," though the only complainant is the state itself, they contribute to the system's corruption with payoffs as a legitimate cost of operation.[3]

Dr. Edith Elisabeth Flynn writes, "The effect has been to sidetrack the system from its mission of protecting society against really serious crime to assuming the dubious role of *policing the private morality*."[4]

---

[1] According to the American Bar Association's *Women in Detention and Statewide Jail Standards*, p. 4, 49.3% are separated, divorced, or widowed; 27% are single; 23% are married.

[2] The Harrison Narcotics Act of 1914 criminalized possession or use of nonprescription narcotics, driving the use of morphine, codeine and heroin underground.

[3] William Nagel, *The New Red Barn*, p. 158.

[4] Edith E. Flynn, "Jails and Criminal Justice," pp. 75-76.

If prostitution, gambling, homosexuality between consenting adults, addiction, and other "marginal" deviations were decriminalized, the criminal justice system could channel more of its time, manpower, and resources to deal with serious, violent crimes.

Programs in jails and prisons could then focus intensively on those men and women who are the greatest threat to society, rather than overcrowding the physical facilities into inhumane warehouses, and gearing the correctional system in terms of security to those few who are really dangerous. The focus has been too much on victimless crimes, while 80% of the real major crime in this country goes unsolved.[1] Police make arrests on only 12% of all reported crimes; out of that 12%, less than 2% are imprisoned.[2]

Prostitution is probably most inappropriately called a crime. Accepted and regulated until the end of the fifteenth century, prostitution was debilitated by the double impact of the Protestant Reformation and a syphilis epidemic. The Protestant emphasis on the virtues of hard work, self-discipline, and abstinence was contrary to a climate of sexual freedom.[3] Even the reigning Pope decried the criminalization of prostitution, seeing it as a necessary outlet for society and that undue pressures would strain the fabric of family relationships.

Prostitution is really the only crime in the penal law where two people are doing a mutually agreed upon activity, and yet only one, the female partner, is subject to arrest. Wharton's *Criminal Law and Procedure* (Anderson Ed.) boldly asserts that the offense of being a prostitute cannot be committed by a man (p. 582) and punishment is often inflicted for an alleged status: namely that of "being a prostitute."

The puritanical distortions of values are evident in the range of laws and treatment of women in crimes of morality, as criminals and as victims. The protection of male clients or prostitutes may be compared to the callous treatment by police and court authorities of a woman who has been raped. "Nice women" don't get raped, and "nice women" don't become prostitutes. The long-held view that arrest of prostitutes would in some way control venereal disease has been disproved. In a three-year study of prostitutes in Seattle, researchers found that less than 1% had syphilis and less than 6% had gonorrhea. Probably 90% of VD is unrelated to prostitution.[4]

Prostitution arrests give the public the impression that the local police are out there "fighting crime." Sporadic sweeps through Boston's Combat Zone or New York's Times Square give visibility to police in action. Though many cities show marked increases in prostitution arrests (Washington, D.C. -- up 798% 1960-1970), statistics on actual incidence of

---

[1] William Nagel, *The New Red Barn*, p. 158.

[2] *Off Our Backs*, April, 1972, p. 2.

[3] Freda Adler, *Sisters in Crime*, p. 56.

[4] *Commonwealth* v. *Barbara Astrofsky*, 1976, pp. 65-66.

crime are misleading. Margery Velimesis in her study of jails and prisons in Pennsylvania reports that increased numbers of arrests reflect increased police activity and different concentrations of police attention, but do not necessarily reflect a corresponding increase in crimes committed.

For instance, in 1967-1968, 13% of the women in jail at Erie, Penn., were charged with shoplifting, while only 2% of the 3,200 women in Philadelphia's House of Correction were held on shoplifting charges. It is difficult to believe that Erie, Penn., actually had a larger percentage of women who shoplifted, but it is understandable that Philadelphia police do not concentrate on arresting women shoplifters.[1]

The United States remains one of the few countries with restrictive laws. France, Britain, Italy, Japan, Germany, and 100 United Nations countries have eliminated the crime of prostitution.

Prostitutes' unions are forming and gaining strength across the United States, from Margo St. James' COYOTE ("Call Off Your Old Tired Ethics") in California to PUMA (Prostitutes Union of Massachusetts) in Massachusetts. They are working with various legal organizations to decriminalize prostitution. While legalization of prostitution has been proposed by some, the COYOTE response to this proposal is that women from lower income groups (who constitute the majority of prostitutes) would be denied access to the profession, by prohibitively expensive licenses.[2] Decriminalization, with concomitant health regulations, is a preferable alternative, removing prostitution from the criminal codes, and putting it back into the sphere of private life where it belongs.

The criminality of prostitution underscores the criminal justice system's fixation of "policing the public morality" -- allegedly protecting innocent men from obscene invitations by women. And what is the cost of this "protection"? Dr. Jennifer James of the University of Washington has estimated the cost of arresting one streetwalker at $1,560.[3] That's just the arresting cost, not the cost of incarceration. When it can cost up to $23,000 per year in taxes to keep a woman in jail,[4] she's not the only one who's paying for the "crime."

The question becomes, for those kinds of costs, what is the public, or the offender, getting out of jail? The answer is we're getting mostly recidivism, with the same people repeatedly coming back. With a 75% recidivism rate, the overall impact of jail confinement is largely negative. The system is a revolving door, a life sentence on the installment plan. Victimless crimes by women rank among the highest recidivists, 52%; women of any age who were most often rearrested were those charged with prostitution.

---

[1] Margery Velimesis, "Women in County Jails and Prisons," p. 5.

[2] Judy Smith, *Women and the Criminal Justice System*, p. 6.

[3] Kate Millett, *Prostitution Papers*, p. 12.

[4] *Female Offenders: Problems and Programs*, p. 20. The $23,000 cost cited is for the District of Columbia Women's Detention Center.

Jails have repeatedly been blamed as breeding ground for more crime, learning how to do it better. First time offenders are housed with repeaters, the young women with the seasoned veterans.

William Nagel documented the contamination effect of jails in the following vignette, which captures the corrosive nature of the confinement process:

"In the barren grilled dayroom of the ward, we found two girls. One was very pretty and the other quite plain. The pretty girl was vivacious; the other withdrawn. They were sitting on a bench talking together when we entered. After a few minutes of introductory comments, we asked ... 'Locked up in here, what do you miss most?'

"The pretty one, without hesitation, shot back, 'Speed, man, speed. It makes you feel so good, so alive, so high. I miss men, too. Their bodies. Sex. Speed and men. That's what I miss.'

"The plain girl said nothing. She sat and stared and possibly thought that speed and men just might be the answers to her unhappiness."[1]

Unfortunately, this vignette is typical of the daily routine of jails, with women trading stories about men and dope in lieu of any meaningful programs to offer them any other avenue for hope. If crime has become a way of life for a woman, she wants to tell the newcomers all the tricks she knows. In jail, there isn't a lot else a woman can do to feel important.

For the high cost of incarceration, the public and the women have a right to demand more. For the thousands each year per person, we could afford to send the women to Harvard, to Europe for the summer, and top it off with a generous weekly allowance. Perhaps the irony is that if that kind of investment were made in an offender -- giving them upper-class opportunities -- we would see the recidivism rates drop substantially. Until the nation's resources are allocated more equitably, the poverty class is going to also become the criminal class, doomed to the revolving doors of jails.

Though the nation's jails can play a role in positively impacting on women's lives, the responsibility for reducing crime rates does not fall on the correctional system alone. Issues of sexism, racism, and classism pervade any analysis of criminal patterns. When we make it possible for life to become more interesting, more challenging -- even more bearable -- for those who are now poor, the crime that plagues our society will begin to decline. This is the task for us as a nation, and we cannot assign it to the police or the courts or the prisons.[2] The churches, the schools, the families have failed women offenders long before they were jailed. It is the responsibility of all of us to share the collective guilt of oppressive conditions, and work together to bring about meaningful change.

---

[1] William Nagel, *The New Red Barn*, p. 35.

[2] Margery Velimesis, "Women in County Jails and Prisons," p. 10.

Administration of Justice

The first written code of laws was engraved in hieroglyphics in a temple in Babylonia, about 1700 B.C. Based on "an eye for an eye," Hammurabi's Code made sure the *punishment equalled, but did not exceed the crime.* The codes were very straightforward about what kinds of punishment would be inflicted for specific crimes. Justice was swift and evenhanded.

Unfortunately, *current criminal justice practices are more inclined to fit the punishment to the criminal, not to the crime.* The closer one is in social class to the sentencing judge, the more she or he will empathize with the hardships of conviction -- losing one's job, one's standing in the community, family respect, and so forth. Judges can understand the disruption of a heavy sentence on a "white collar criminal" -- bad publicity, getting another job, etc. -- because the judge and the criminal have the same lifestyle. She or he can relate to the criminal's situation, particularly if the criminal is white, middle class, and male.

Though the FBI's *Uniform Crime Reports* have shown a steadily rising crime rate, absent from the Reports are crimes committed by the rich and powerful against the rest of the population: murder, assault, and theft via violation of health and safety codes by slum landlords, mine owners, construction companies, robbery by the food industry through deceptive packaging, and doctors getting rich off Medicare patients. Criminals are not the manufacturers of unsafe cars that in the next year will cause thousands to perish in flaming highway wrecks.[1]

"Crime in America is equated with primitive physical action. When a crime is unsophisticated and 'primitive,' the punishment is primitive. The more primitive the crime, the more primitive the punishment. The more intellectual synthesis, abstraction, and creativity in a crime, the less it is perceived as crime and the more it interests lawyers, prosecutors, and judges -- who basically live by intellect, rather than by action. The same is true of the general public, who condemn a crime of action before an intellectual crime."[2]

There is evidence that a high proportion of people in all walks of life have at some time or other committed what are conventionally called "serious crimes." A study of 1,700 New Yorkers weighted toward the upper income brackets, who had never been arrested for anything and who were guaranteed anonymity, revealed that *91 percent had committed at least one felony or serious misdemeanor.*[3] Before any of us makes a judgment about the activities of offenders -- male or female -- "it is good for all of us to realize that we have some larceny in our hearts," wrote Dr. Ernest L.V. Shelley, Board of Directors of the National Information Center on Volunteerism.[4]

---

[1] Jessica Mitford, *Kind and Usual Punishment*, p. 83.

[2] Kathryn Burkhart, *Women in Prison*, p. 31.

[3] Jessica Mitford, *Kind and Usual Punishment*, p. 57.

[4] Ivan H. Scheier et al., *The Church as Volunteer in Courts and Corrections*, p. 1.

Unfortunately, the facts do indicate that the administration of justice is a class issue. Besides the fact that the poor are more likely to get caught, money also makes a difference between those who are in the community awaiting trial and those who are imprisoned.

For women, the issue is complicated by sexism on the part of the law enforcement and judicial systems, as well as racism. Frances A. Kellor pointed out in 1907 that in the South the pardoning power of the executives was not equally applied to white and black women. White women were generally pardoned because prison conditions were considered unfit for them, but no such consideration was shown to black women.[1]

Similar differential treatment still exists. Sheriff George Sampson, Rockingham County, New Hampshire, ordered to local nursing homes three women who were convicted of occupying the Seabrook, N.H., nuclear power plant in a political demonstration, rather than sentence them to the Hillsborough jail in Manchester. *"We're dealing with nice people,"* Sheriff Sampson said, "they're my neighbors. I don't think they would have liked the conditions in the county jail."[2]

Had the women in the "Seabrook 11" been poor black militants, it is unlikely that Sheriff Sampson or County Superior Court Judge Maurice Mois would have been so concerned about their "liking" the jail conditions.

Anyone visiting a prison, jail, court, or police station will immediately see the disproportionate number of minority women and men who are arrested and processed through the system. Of the nearly half a million Americans behind bars at this very minute, over half are black.[3] Since the 1800s, the lower classes and immigrants have filled our institutions. First it was the Irish, then the Eastern Europeans, and later the Blacks and Spanish-speaking.[4] The common denominator is poverty: men and women who are outside the dominant white middle-class social structure.

For women, the disposition of justice is as sex-biased as the rest of the culture. We have consistently put woman on a pedestal, so that when she falls from that precarious height, like a plaster statue, she is broken into pieces. Her reputation is shattered.[5]

The sex bias begins with juvenile courts, where girls tend to be overprosecuted for sexual misbehavior, and underprosecuted for aggressive behavior. Boys' sexual activity is more socially tolerated. After all, "boys will be boys."

---

[1] Otto Pollak, *The Criminality of Women*, p. 118.

[2] "Seabrook 11 Released, October 23, Next Protest," *The Real Paper*, Boston, Mass., September 26, 1976.

[3] *Profile of the Female Offender*, Texas Department of Corrections, p. 2; Omar Hendrix, *A Study of Neglect*, p. 38.

[4] David J. Rothman, "History of Prisons, Asylums and Other Decaying Institutions," *Prisoners Rights Sourcebook*, p. 10.

[5] Marie Buckley, *Breaking into Prison: A Citizen Guide to Volunteer Action*, p. 96.

The juvenile courts, the "family courts," act as parents to girls, more as a social than legal authority, with a narrower tolerance for sexual deviance. Courts tend to act more as guardians of sex-stereotyped values than on violations of the law.[1]

This pattern follows a woman into court as an adult. Probably one of the more pronounced examples of statutory sex-biased differences in sentencing for the same crime is Pennsylvania's Muncy Act, which prescribes different and frequently more severe treatment for females than males on a guilty plea. Similar laws exist in Connecticut, Maryland, Ohio, Massachusetts, and Kansas.[2]

When women commit "masculine" crimes, they are judged with patronizing leniency. When they engage in "feminine" offenses, they violate the values society assigns to female morality and since they pose a threat to the existing order, they are punished more severely.

Judges tend to respond by either seeing women as their mothers or daughters or sisters, and being lenient as they might with an errant child; or throwing the book at the defendant, in reaction to the discrepancy between what is normally expected of women, and the woman defendant's alleged behavior.[3]

These divergent responses to women's behavior are from a primarily male perspective, as the number of women judges is appallingly small. Similarly, the number of women police officers, prosecutors, attorneys, or correctional officers is also extremely small ... an issue which the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) addressed in the 1975 *Task Force Report on Women*. Besides the obvious issues of unequal job opportunities for women interested in the field of criminal justice, the impact also carries over to the treatment of women offenders. Characteristically, male officials in the criminal justice system regard the problems of female offenders as insignificant. They have not addressed women's needs and problems, or their own biases about women committing crimes.

Though the erratic leniency toward women and girl offenders works to their advantage when the judge suspends a sentence, or the police officer fails to report the offense, it works heavily against the woman when she finally is sent to jail. She is apt to get longer sentences than men for the same crime, and suffer the enigmatic indeterminate sentence.[4]

---

[1] Freda Adler, *Sisters in Crime*, p. 92.

[2] Edith E. Flynn, "The Special Problems of Female Offenders," p. 114.

[3] Rita James Simon, *Women and Crime*, p. 52.

[4] A judge can impose two kinds of sentences -- one in which a minimum and maximum term is delineated, and the other, the indeterminate sentence, in which only the maximum sentence is indicated. Women are more apt to get the latter kind of sentence, which means that the minimum term of their incarceration is not spelled out. That is determined by the woman's behavior within the institution, presumably evaluated on the basis of how pliable and submissive she acts.

Though the "chivalry factor" may work to women's advantage when the criminal justice system is lenient, it often means that women in jail are less apt to be first offenders than their male counterparts. They have a higher record of previous arrests than men who are incarcerated for the first time. An estimated 62% of female detainees and 80% of sentenced women have a previous record.[1]

In many ways, the double standard of justice complicates rehabilitation efforts. The woman has received lenient punishment for the offenses in the past, and often it makes little sense to her why she finally was incarcerated.

If equitable services are to be offered to women, then the administration of justice needs to be equal. This may mean that less leniency will be evident for women's first offenses, but it also means the *development of meaningful options that can be offered earlier.*

The most notable attempt to improve the quality of justice has been evidenced in the Fifth Judicial District Department of Court Services, Court of Iowa, which is almost universally referred to as the "Des Moines Project."

The Des Moines Project coordinates four services for defendants and convicted offenders: pretrial release-on-own recognizance, pretrial supervised release, probation, and residence at a correctional facility offering work and education release. Services are available to women as well as men.

Besides offering a more humane criminal justice system, it has proved to be cost efficient as well. In 1973, the Des Moines Project saved the county and state correctional systems an estimated $454,229. The pretrial components also saved defendants an estimated $154,000 for the cost of bail bonds, and enabled many men and women to retain their jobs and support their families.[2] Demonstrations of the Des Moines Project are being tried in various other communities across the country, adopting the four model component. The project claims most of its success in improving the *quality* of justice.

The four components provide a unified system, eliminating overlapping and splintered administration, and evaluation of the project has indicated that rehabilitation of offenders is probably most successful when all of the components of the criminal justice system communicate and cooperate with each other.

The Des Moines Project has consistently stressed employment, education, training, and counseling for women in the program, according to Jim Hancock, Director of the Women's Residential Facility in Des Moines.

---

[1] ABA, *Women in Detention and Statewide Jail Standards*, p. 14.

[2] "Exemplary Project," *LEAA Newsletter*, Vol. 4, No. 10, Washington, D.C., May 1975, p. 21.

The Des Moines system has proved the cost and recidivism effectiveness of minimizing the punishment component, and maximizing the rehabilitative component. *Its global focus has also assisted the judicial function by providing resources for the judges to utilize.* It may be that the issues of class, race, and sex can be dealt with more equitably when meaningful community resources are available to the judge who is passing sentence.

This section has attempted to give the novice to corrections an overview of the system that brings a woman to jail. Neglect and indifference have been rampant throughout history. Due perhaps to their relatively small number and their predominantly nonmilitant posture, women inmates have been neglected, even by the women's rights and prisoners' rights movements. The political consciousness that is so prevalent in male institutions is generally lacking in women's correctional facilities, where submission and docility prevail.[1]

Since there are more women in jails than in state and federal prisons combined, perhaps ten times as many, it is time to address the conditions in the women's sections of the nation's jails.

The attempt has been made to question the very appropriateness of confining most women offenders in jails in the first place, but one cannot rest on intellectual, Marxist, feminist discussions and continue to overlook the women whose reality is that they *are* in jail. Until the criminal laws change, until the judges abandon sexist sentencing procedures, thousands of women each year are going to suffer the overriding neglect and abuse of jails.

"I'm tired of being tired," said one young woman in a modern New England jail. "You can talk all you want about the laws being changed. But that doesn't do a damn thing for me right now. Somebody's gotta care about me, *now*. Somebody's gotta do something to help me so I never have to come back."

---

[1] Marilyn Haft, *Clearinghouse Review*, p. 6.

Warehousing

No lady

Prison didn't improve me none.

There was ten of us girls in the county jail, five white, five black awaitin' trial for sellin shit.

The white girls, they all on probation.

Us black girls, we all go to Dwight. Me, three months gone.

An I ask myself sittin on them concrete benches in the county.

How come? How come me an my sisters goin to jail

An the white girls goin back to college?

Their mothers come in here -- nose spread all over her face -- she weepin too

But I goin to Dwight.

An I think about that -- But I don't come up with no answers.

-- Anonymous, about Dwight Reformatory for Women, Dwight, Ill., reprinted from *"The Chicago Seed."*

Off Our Backs, April 1972, p. 2.

Physical Facilities

For over a quarter of a century, prison men and women, borrowing from one of their revered leaders, Austin MacCormick, have been saying, "If only I had the right staff, I could run a good prison in an old red barn."[1]

Unfortunately, most jails in this country are the old red barns of correctional institutions, with the decrepit brick fortresses reminiscent of the French Bastille. The most enlightened sociological thinking of the last generation has done little to improve the physical facilities of jails, and nothing for the women's sections of those institutions.

Though it is easy to cast the blame on insensitive sheriffs, *community indifference* and neglect have caused human beings to be treated as slaves, left to ferment in social warehouses.

The courts have been as unconcerned as the community at large. Judges rarely see the inside of the local jail, perhaps the most revealing indicator of the fragmentation of the criminal justice system.

Tragically, the physical accommodation of jail inmates has not kept pace with the increasing crime rate. Many experts have urged a moratorium on building new jails and prisons, agreeing that our present system and facilities do not work.

However, with the rising crime rate and the moratorium on construction, the nation's jails have become grossly overcrowded. The substitution of community residential facilities for women's jails has made little inroads, despite their recommendation as an alternative to jail custody for most women requiring detention.[2]

Though some communities have been supportive of halfway houses and prerelease centers for women inmates, most are (at best) reluctant and (at worst) hostile to the concept *in their neighborhood*. Statistics fail to show any increased crime in the neighborhoods of halfway houses, or reduction in property values, yet these arguments are the most commonly used to block community-based facilities.

The women's sections of the jails are badly neglected. Because *the jails were built primarily to house men,* the women's section is very often an afterthought of construction. Whether they are set up dormitory style, with all the women living 24 hours a day in one big room, or in a cell

---

[1] William G. Nagel, *The New Red Barn: A Critical Look at the Modern American Prison,* fact sheet. MacCormick was formerly assistant director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and once corrections commissioner of New York City.

[2] American Bar Association, *Women in Detention and Statewide Jail Standards,* p. 2.

block, the facility is usually inaccessible, cramped, and closed. Traffic from the women's section to other parts of the institution is usually not allowed on the grounds of "security." This out-of-the-way women's facility exudes a pronounced lack of mobility, and a suffocating isolation.

Very often, women are not provided with exercise yards, day rooms, or religious services, much less a library, education center, or training facility. Though services may be available elsewhere in the institution, women are infrequently allowed access to them. The reasons range from the fear of mixing men and women inmates, to the shortage of female staff to accompany the women, to cost benefits, to dismissing any such programs on the basis that "the girls" (as women offenders are often referred to) aren't interested anyway.

Urban jails are few in number, but hold over 50% of the country's jail population, and are consistently and dangerously overcrowded. Their chief characteristics are crippling idleness, anonymous brutality, human degradation, and repression.[1] Major cities such as Chicago, New York, or Los Angeles have separate (but not equal) jails for women.

Living quarters in the smaller jails tend to be cottage style (individual rooms) or dormitory type facilities, as opposed to cell blocks. They are typically an "add on" to a male institution.

The smaller jails are apt to regiment the women inmates less than the urban jails with less emphasis on surveillance. However, women in the smaller jails are generally restricted in terms of physical mobility and access to social service programs. In all the jails, overcrowding is often combined with boredom.

"If I had to do two years in a jail, I think I'd end up in a straitjacket," said Berties, a woman offender whose ride through the mill of the Pennsylvania criminal justice system is reported in Norman Hayes, *Lady in a Cage:*

"I mean, that ain't exactly the Holiday Inn, you know. What they do is crowd you in a little cell that smells like shit and Lysol. You sit there all day and play cards to stare out the window or something thrilling like that."[2]

The confinement of women inmates in one cramped section of the jail puts restrictions on all aspects of programming. Where diverse physical facilities for male inmates enable them to choose between attending classes, working out in the physical exercise area, using the library, getting counseling, visiting the chapel, studying or participating in training classes, women's units rarely have the physical space for equally diverse functions. For women, jailers have found television to be a most inexpensive placebo.[3]

---

[1] Edith E. Flynn, "Jails and Criminal Justice," in Lloyd E. Ohlin's *Prisoners in America*, p. 59.

[2] Norman Hayes, *Lady in a Cage*, p. 2. Originally printed in the December 1974 issue of *Philly Talk Magazine*.

[3] William Nagel, *The New Red Barn*, p. 27.

Ironically, a Michigan study revealed that nine out of ten inmates learned new tricks and improved their criminal expertise by watching TV crime programs. Four out of ten said they attempted specific crimes they saw on television crime dramas. "It's like you have a lot of intelligent, creative minds -- all those Hollywood writers -- working for you. They keep coming up with new ideas. They'll lay it all out for you, too: show you the type of evidence the cops look for, how they track you, and so on."[1] TV watching may be a seemingly innocuous inmate activity to the jailers, but to the inmates, its function may be more pragmatic than entertaining.

As well as the physical deprivation, the lack of privacy can be equally overwhelming. A woman can never be alone, to think, to cry, to do anything. She and the group of other inmates are a collective that is almost never divided; the tension consistently runs high.

The issue of chronic overcrowding of jails is increasingly being viewed as "cruel and unusual punishment," under the Eighth Amendment to the Constitution. Class action suits have been brought to court on these grounds in several counties across the country.[2] Habeas Corpus has been the chief method for inmates to challenge the legal authority for their lack of basic health care, unsanitary conditions, and other aggregate issues violating an inmate's constitutional rights.[3]

Jill Raymond, who was locked up in the Richmond, Kentucky, jails, said, "It's important to sue jails, even though few cases are won, because it works as a lever against jail officials. The fear of exposure makes them behave a little better."[4]

Building new jails isn't necessarily the answer: the "new red barns" are in some ways more oppressive than the old. They are full of electronic gadgetry and surveillance equipment more appropriate for a state prison holding dangerous convicts than for a jail holding misdemeanants and the accused.

One new jail boasts a separate women's building, an educational center, gymnasium, medical center, work release building, electronic sliding doors, doubles fences topped with barbed wire, camera monitors, and attack dogs prowling the perimeter. The price tag for the whole facility was in the millions. The women's building reflects as little day-to-day activity as one would see in the old bastille-type jails. The women sit in a stupor

---

[1] Grant H. Hendrick, "When Television is a School for Criminals," *TV Guide*, p. 5.

[2] Cook County (Ill.) Jail, the New Orleans (La.) Parish Prison, Little Rock (Ark.) County Jail, the District of Columbia Jail, two county jails in California, and others. From Ronald Goldfarb's *Jails*, p. 403.

[3] Ibid., pp. 397-399.

[4] *Off Our Backs: A Women's News Journal*, November/December 1976, p. 6, in interview with Alice Henry.

in the day room with no place to go and nothing to do but console each other over the endless blare of television and radios. The expensive new jail made no equitable physical provisions for women, to offer them the same diverse programs available to men. "Security" prevents the women from being able to leave their building to attend classes, work out in the gym, use the library, education facilities, or any of the amenities offered men in this new jail.

In jails across the country, the women inmates enjoy none of the physical diversity or mobility, or resource utilization of their male counterparts. They sit, or sleep, or play cards, or watch television. They are still an afterthought in construction, still the forgotten offenders.

Correctional Staff

A force of over 120,000 people administers corrections on all federal, state, county, and municipal levels ... 80% of whom have custodial responsibilities within the institutions.[1] The remaining 20% are primarily probation and parole officers, with a very small percentage of psychologists and social workers in the institutions. In the county jail, one is apt to have (at best) only one or two social workers for the entire institution; their primary focus is on the problems of the male population.

Any programs for women in jail must address the background, training, and perspectives of the security staff. The typical female correctional officer is middle-aged, white, and low to middle class. She has a high school education. Her status in the jail is generally lower than her male counterpart, and she usually is paid less. As an employee of the jail, she usually has little power or little say in how the women's unit is run. Those decisions are generally made by the male sheriff or male security officer.

Where women's prisons in this country have moved toward a humanistic approach to incarceration, the jails are still set up in the "cops and robbers" mode. With matrons and male guards wearing uniforms and bearing intimidating military titles, the strong identification with the military unduly influences the entire jail operation. It exacerbates the deep chasm between the keepers and the kept.[2]

The women (and men) inmates in jails have no other response except to play out the cops and robbers game. The correctional officers' position of absolute authority and power solidifies the inmate culture, diverting inmate energy from self-development activities to resistance to the ever-present authority.

Keeping in mind that the vast majority of women in jails are *not* violent offenders, the omnipresent security focus is incongruous to the actual needs of incarcerating a female inmate population. Women in jails have no history of riots, escapes, violence of any kind -- toward each other or toward the correctional staff. However, because the institution is set up primarily to house men, the focus of security for the women parallels that for the men.

The continual deprivation of privacy -- the strip searches, the censorship of mail, the restrictions on reading materials, restrictions on visitors, restrictions on personal possessions -- all are justified by administrators under one great blanket theme: *security*.

Newcomers to corrections should remember the concerns of the correctional staff go in this order: first, security; second, security; third, security, according to Marie Buckley, author of *Breaking into Prison: A Citizen's Guide to Volunteer Action*.

---

[1] Janet Harris, *Crisis in Corrections*, p. 4.

[2] Edith E. Flynn, "Jails and Criminal Justice," pp. 64-66.

Reinforcement for this authoritarian position comes from the public itself; they are more concerned that nobody escapes from the local jail than they are that meaningful rehabilitation be offered within the institution. The local officials know that their continued employment is tied to the successful performance of custody -- and one escape is enough to arouse a furor of public outrage.[1] The fact that women are treated as if they were violent male offenders -- even though few have acted in such a way as to justify excessive security -- confirms the focus of jail as male-oriented, totally overlooking the realities of the female population.

With the constant barrage of rules and obedience to authority, perhaps it is no wonder that female inmates do not respond well in situations outside requiring that they deal with authority figures -- particularly on jobs. They develop no mechanisms for dealing with conflict, or conflict resolution. Authority comes to be lumped together as all controlling and inhibiting. One can never disagree with an authority figure, thus reducing the person to a robot without normal vitality, or a tightly wound spring, ready to react at the first opportunity.

Any attempt to develop a rehabilitation program for women in jails must address the input of the female correctional officers, who *could* be utilized as counselors, as well as security personnel. A 40-hour 13-week human relations training program was offered to correctional staff at the Georgia Rehabilitation Center for Women. A randomly selected sample of 105 inmates revealed that anxiety levels were significantly decreased, their interest in social relationships increased, and the correctional officers' ability to communicate was improved.[2]

Caring about individuals so that they can begin to help themselves is difficult in closed institutional settings, where people tend to become numbers, and where even positive programs may become so authoritarian that the effects are punitive.[3] It is important in planning a program for the women in your local county jail that the emphasis be put on hiring (or recruiting) staff that can relate to clients, and then training them in necessary skills. This is far better than hiring staff that have certain professional skills, and then trying to train them to relate.

The staff's treatment of women in jails ranges from "benign neglect" to overt brutality. Berties, a young first offender, relates this account of her arrest and booking. "The police pushed me against the car and patted me down. That's how they get their rocks off. Then they put me in handcuffs and took me to the Montgomery County Jail. I was booked on armed robbery, reckless driving, disturbing the peace, and some other charges. After they took my mug shots and my fingerprints, they turned me over to a matron, some woman who looked like John Wayne. She searched me. I had to strip naked

---

[1] Gresham M. Sykes, *Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*, p. 18.

[2] Susan Ellen Katrin, "Effects on Women Inmates of Facilitation Training Provided Correctional Officers," *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol 1, No. 1 (March 1974).

[3] Margery Velimesis, *Women in County Jails and Prisons*, p. 9.

for that. I had to bend over and spread my cheeks and let her poke her fingers where they didn't belong. She was looking for drugs. Since she couldn't find any, she started looking for lice. She couldn't find any of those, either, but she sprayed my hair with disinfectant just to be safe. Then she gave me a gray dress to wear and took me to the women's section of the jail. I couldn't make bail, so I had to stay there until my trial came up."[1]

Jail standards generally require that a woman correctional officer be on duty 24 hours a day to supervise women inmates, but the reality is that in many jails, women aren't jailed often enough to justify the expense of full-time matrons. Moore County, N.C., Sheriff C. G. Wimberly said that during a year, his jail doesn't average one woman prisoner a day, and that he can't justify hiring full-time matrons.[2]

Unfortunately, this problem of having only partial coverage by a woman officer leads to sexual abuse of women in jails by male staff. Mary Ann Largen of Arlington, Virginia, who attended the Joan Little trial as an observer for the National Organization for Women, is on a NOW task force studying abuses to women offenders. Noting that women who are assaulted don't report it, she said, "Even if the women themselves come forward, nobody outside cares anyway. They figure if you're in there, it's because you're bad."[3]

Too many jail administrators are insensitive to this problem of sexual abuse of women in jails, and as is true of society toward the issue of rape, tend to blame it on the women. "Face it: if you're a woman in jail, you've got nothing. And if you want something, you've got only one thing that can get it for you," reported Sheriff Donald Stahl, Mecklenburg County (N.C.).[4]

Though there are some legitimate cases of false accusations, women are nonetheless vulnerable to sexual assaults by jailers, deputies, or even male trustees when they are locked in a bare cell and have no female supervision. "Women have been raped throughout history" commented Assata Shakur at Riker's Island, New York, "and now when we fight back, now that we have the consciousness to fight back, they call us violent."[5]

Though it is important that women's quarters be supervised by female correctional staff, recognition of the need for coed counseling staff is increasing. The administrators of several female institutions have felt that the institutional atmosphere is more "natural" when members of both sexes are present.[6] This is proposed in recognition that a significant percentage of

---

[1] Norman Hayes, *Lady in a Cage*, pp. 1-2.

[2] Susan Jetton, "Jail Rapes Worry Women's Groups," *The Charlotte Observer*, December 19, 1976.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] *Off Our Backs*, January/February 1976, p. 4.

[6] Arditi et al., *The Sexual Segregation of American Prisons*, pp. 20-21.

women in jails have been sexually abused or otherwise mistreated by men at an early age, and undoubtedly feel a deep distrust for all men. Yet, in the context of an all female staff, they are not afforded the opportunity to learn how to establish meaningful relationships with men, even in a teacher-pupil or counselor-client relationship.

While underscoring the imperative of female officers protecting the privacy of female inmates, the recent Corrections Standards of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals also pointed out that employing men in the women's sections, particularly as treatment personnel, helps make the institution as normal as possible.[1]

Coeducational institutions such as Framingham State Prison in Massachusetts are indicative of the diminished tension that can result from more normative interaction. Officers dress and look like counselors, who look no different from the inmates themselves. Dropping the use of uniforms and badges breaks down some of the barriers between the keepers and the kept, and all can respond to each other as people, rather than stereotypes.

A diminished "cops and robbers" environment can still maintain the institution's need for security, without totally sacrificing the women's needs. Providing sensitivity training for staff, as well as integrating them into any program planning for the women's section, are vital to changing the orientation of the women's unit from high security to more humane, productive incarceration.

---

[1] ABA, *Women in Detention and Statewide Jail Standards*, p. 24.

Social Service Programs

Most women already know how to scrub a floor and wash a window. Yet, for the majority of women in jails, floor scrubbing and window washing is the extent of their "rehabilitation" program.

In a 1975 report prepared by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) Task Force on Women, Chairperson Marlene Beckman reported that total funds expended on programs for female offenders totaled only $13,387,272 from 1969 through 1975.[1] The LEAA allocations indicate that while community programs and services are proliferating, the rate of program growth has been nowhere as rapid for women as for men.

It was the conclusion of the 25-person LEAA Task Force that regional coordinators should be aware of the rising concern for female offenders as a previously neglected population, and show some receptivity to proposals addressing their needs.

Despite the 1975 directive, in the 1978 guidelines for funding, women's programs were completely omitted from the funding priorities.

For women in jails, rehabilitation is revealed as worse than meaningless: tranquilizers distributed wholesale to insure passivity; token sex-tracked or nonexistent training programs; petty rules; denial of even minimal civil rights; isolation from family and friends; and helplessness in the face of arbitrary authority.[2] Women in jail are the first to agree that the jail serves more as a school for crime than as a rehabilitation center. The endless dead time leads to inmate gaming and criminal contamination.[3]

---

[1] Marlene Beckman, *The Report of the LEAA Task Force on Women*, October 1, 1975. To put this in perspective, keep in mind that in 1977, LEAA funded over $750 million in police, probation, parole, juvenile, and corrections programs across the country. Federal funds for women offenders were allocated through the Part E Discretionary Grants, Section 7, "Offenders with Special Program Needs," which lumps together the retarded, hard-core, career criminals and female offenders. The dollar range of programs under Section 7 ranged from $25,000-$50,000, while most other sections list the dollar range of grants from $75,000 and up.

[2] *Women Behind Bars*, p. 4.

[3] Only 12% of all the nation's jails operate federally-sponsored manpower training and support programs, according to the 1972 *Survey of Inmates of Local Jails*. In locally sponsored programs, six out of ten provided facilities for religious services, but no other single type of program was found. Only about 10% of the jail population participated in any program. Only 8% participated in a work release program, with blacks having a slightly smaller representation than their share of the total sentenced inmate population.

Few jails make any specific reference to or allocation for the special needs of female offenders, in terms of environment (sanitation, nutrition, space, privacy), personal services (recreation, visiting, contact with children), or programs (vocational, remedial education, counseling).[1] The only special provisions that appear with regularity are rules relating to the segregation of male and female prisoners, and use of female supervisors, and prohibitions of male staff access to female quarters without a matron present. Despite the fact that Standard 2.8 of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals sets forth the right of offenders to be free of discriminatory treatment (on the basis of race, religion, nationality, sex, or political beliefs), the fact still remains that women in jails are discriminated against on the basis of sex, and discrimination on that basis solely is invidious.[2]

The Northeast seems to be somewhat more inclined than the rest of the country to implement programs for men (50% offer recreational programs vs. 14% nationally; 43% offer educational facilities vs. 11% nationally; 77% offer medical services vs. 60% in the West, 54% in the North Central U.S. and 43% in the South).[3] However, *no area of the country shows any significant pattern of equitable programs for women.*

In the historic *Brown* v. *Board of Education* case, the Supreme Court invalidated the doctrine of "separate but equal" in the racial context. The same reasoning applies to segregation by sex. In a comparison of social service programs available for men and women inmates at 47 male and 15 female institutions, the average number of programs for men was 10, compared to 2.7 for women. Male inmates had a choice of 50 vocational options, while women could choose from only 6, all service oriented.[4]

The rationale against providing equal services for women is usually based on the cost, but the question of whether money should be spent on services for women must be answered in the affirmative, legally as well as morally. In *Seidenberg* v. *McSorley's Old Ale House,* a federal district court rejected the argument that a tavern could not accommodate women because it lacked the necessary restrooms, since *only its past policy of discrimination had prevented it from making such an expenditure in the first place.*[5] Jail administrators who claim programming is not physically possible because of space limitations for women can no longer rely on this argument to block implementation of women's programs.

Where women are excluded from training programs, work release, halfway houses, furloughs, and other advantages available to male inmates, a challenge should be made under the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth

---

[1] ABA *Women in Detention and Statewide Jail Standards,* p. 27.

[2] Marilyn Haft, "Women in Prison: Discriminatory Practices and Some Legal Solutions," *Clearinghouse Review,* p. 5.

[3] *1970 National Jail Census,* p. 4.

[4] Rita James Simon, *Women and Crime,* pp. 82-83.

[5] Marilyn Haft, *Clearinghouse Review,* p. 5.

Amendment. According to a plurality of the Supreme Court in *Frontiero* v. *Richardson,* the state must show a compelling interest before it may afford different treatment to persons on the basis of sex. It is clear that counties have no compelling interest to justify discriminatory treatment of female inmates. In *Reed* v. *Reed,* the Supreme Court also rules that different treatment of persons by the state on the basis of sex must bear a rational relationship to state objectives. In most instances of discriminatory treatment of female inmates, that test cannot be met.

Justice Abe Fortas wrote that our cases hold that people who stand in the same relationship to their government cannot be treated differently by that government. To do so would be to treat them as if they were, somehow, less than people.[1]

Though the court process is time consuming, and corrections facilities are slow to implement change, the precedents are growing in favor of equal treatment of women inmates.

In a New Mexico court case, *Barefield v. Leach,* a federal court held that female inmates were entitled to equal treatment with males. It provided that women and men should have proportionately equal amounts of money spent on programs, but that programs need not necessarily be the same. The court held that the small number of women offenders was no excuse for poor, unequal programming.[2] Even though county jails are not required to provide programs, once they do, they cannot exclude whole classes of inmates from participation on a discriminatory basis.

The exclusion of women from work release in Los Angeles County was challenged in *People* v. *Lemon.* In that case, the defendant was to be sentenced to the county jail for six months. The sentencing judge expressed his desire to recommend her for participation in work release, and made clear his view that denying women access to such programs presented serious constitutional difficulties.[3]

In *Dawson* v. *Carberry,* inmates of San Francisco's female jail sued in federal district court to gain participation in a work-furlough program from which they had been excluded. Jail officials claimed it would be too expensive to provide this program for the few women prisoners. The judge considered the exclusion of women from the program to be unconstitutional, as a violation of the equal protection clause.

However, despite *Dawson,* the precedents suggest that an equal protection challenge must be directed not to the absence or inadequacy of any one

---

[1] Edith Flynn, "The Special Problems of Female Offenders," p. 114.

[2] Mary E. King, "Working Paper--The Female Offender and Employment," p. 7.

[3] Katherine Krause, "Denial of Work Release Programs to Women: A Violation of Equal Protection," pp. 1460-1461.

program, but rather to the overall inferiority of the program and services available to women.[1] Class action suits are being brought before the courts more and more on behalf of women in jails, and sensitive judges across the country are asking for special reports, outside consultants and timetables for change. They are disallowing any excuses based on cost or political problems.

Incarceration under present conditions is likely to produce depressive reaction, with little in the way of rehabilitation, the learning of marketable skills, or increased motivation. Positive change in the offender is likely to occur to the extent that the flexibility of the facility and implementation of programs diminishes the depression.[2] Though most jails indicate that women are required to perform some work responsibilities each day, most enlightened administrators are unwilling to consider housekeeping duties synonymous with vocational training. The majority of tasks are menial and unskilled in nature, and irrelevant to the sophisticated labor market of the major urban centers, to which the majority of the women will return.[3]

The history of unemployment of women offenders confirms the need for educational and vocational programming, and the average ex-offender seeking to start up again knows how badly the jails have failed to provide meaningful career development. It seems obvious that female offenders have as great a need as men for learning marketable skills, inasmuch as most are going to have to support themselves and their children after release.

The 1972 *Survey of Inmates of Local Jails*[4] revealed that during the year preceding their admission, 50% of jailed offenders earned an income below that defined by the government as poverty level.

The educational level tells the same story. Only 35% of jailed inmates nationally have graduated from high school. Inmates who have had at most an eighth grade education comprise about 25% of the total jail population. Approximately 40% have entered but never completed high school. At least 15% of the nation's female offender population are "functionally illiterate," meaning they are reading below the sixth grade level.[5] The mandate is

---

[1] Haft, *Clearinghouse Review*, p. 5; Krause, "Denial of Work Release," p. 1461; Arditi et al., "Sexual Segregation," p. 23.

[2] Dr. Clorinda Margolies, "First Impressions in the House of Corrections--Women's Wing," p. 4.

[3] Marlene Beckman, *Report of the LEAA Task Force on Women*, p. 5.

[4] *Survey of Inmates of Local Jails*, p. 3.

[5] Catherine Pierce, "Educational Opportunities for Women Offenders," *The Woman Offender Report*, Vol. 1, No. 4, Nov/Dec. 1975, p. 5. The implications of female illiteracy are staggering when one thinks of a woman's need to use and understand employment notices, job applications, food stamp applications, rental and housing contracts, as well as other written, legal documents.

clearly evident to provide educational and vocational training for women in the jails, despite the inherent problems of high turnover and small daily population. There is no need to question that the means of making a livelihood is the single most critical problem facing the woman offender.[1] Because jobs and training for them are generally unavailable, welfare or continued dependence on crime are the only remaining alternatives.

Experience of manpower training programs, such as the NAB-JOBS programs, has revealed that *training the hard-core unemployed was not primarily a matter of teaching skills, but a matter of deep social reorientation.* For rehabilitation to succeed, the offender must want to lead a normal, productive life within society's rules; and she must acquire the skills and ability to do so. The first part, which may involve trying to overcome years of emotional deprivation, is the most difficult. The second part is simple only by comparison.[2] Educational and vocational programs for women in jails cannot be offered in a vacuum; they must be offered in a context that recognizes the complexity of a woman's needs, and education must be defined broader than just academic pursuits. A coordinated program of social education relates academic class work and job training with personal counseling, medical services, community involvement, consumer education, family education, child development, personal grooming, survival skills, and positive recreational skills.

Few educational or vocational training programs can be completed while a woman is in jail; it is, therefore, important that programs be planned so that they can be continued after release. Programs that are ongoing in the community are economical to provide, and offer a system that recognizes the need for a continuity of services and enhanced communication between agencies.[3]

An essential component of any program for women offenders is the direct involvement of women's organizations, such as the YWCA, National Organization for Women, or Junior League. Groups must be responsible and persistent in developing programs; administrators know that projects that generate hope in a jail, and then fall apart, are simply harbingers of trouble. Therefore, they want reasonable assurance of successful completion before they approve a plan at all.[4] Whether you propose to start with a sewing class, or a full-scale education program, the administration of the jail has seen enough of "do-gooders" who show up for a few sessions and then disappear.

---

[1] The prime concern of women offenders who rioted at the Alderson Federal Reformatory for Women in September 1971 was that Congress appropriate adequate funds to provide relevant, functional educational/vocational rehabilitation programs, according to Kathryn Burkhart, *Women in Prison*, p. 167.

[2] Marcia Hovey, "The Forgotten Offenders," p. 38.

[3] LEAA's First Exemplary Project Award was given to the Des Moines Project in 1972, for the way they had brought correctional and community programs together, with the emphasis on making use of existing resources. Rob Wilson, "Replicating LEAA's First Outstanding Project," *Corrections Magazine*, September 1976, p. 20.

[4] Marie Buckley, *Breaking into Prison*, p. 63.

Responsibility toward the women inmates is equally important, to avoid becoming just one more social service agency. These women have dealt with enough agencies. Agencies don't break down anyone's sense of isolation -- people need to talk to other people.[1] Because of the scarcity of funding for social service programs in jail (particularly any earmarked for women), the use of volunteers and paraprofessionals on loan from other agencies as instructors, counselors, and advocates should be considered.

The rising level of education in the United States and the growing "credentialling" requirements are leaving a bigger gap between the undereducated offender and society at large. Job training, education, and socialization programs for women in jails must be developed to keep up with the norms in other aspects of society.[2] Though jail administrators might refer to the high cost of offering social service programs for their female population, the cost of offering educational/vocational opportunities is much less expensive than the return of an offender to the institution. When successful, such educational programs provide a permanent tool that the woman can use throughout her life.

---

[1] *Off Our Backs*, April 1972, p. 21.

[2] John N. Mitchell, "New Doors, Not Old Walls," in Edward M. Scott & Kathryn L. Scott, *Criminal Rehabilitation ... Within and Without the Walls*, p. 202.

Punishing

The broad effects which can be obtained by punishment are the increase of fear, the lack of trust, the sharpening of the sense of cunning, the mastery of the desires: so it is that punishment tames the person, but does not make [her] "better."

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche
Genealogy of Morals (1887)
Essay 2, Aphorism 15

Problems for Incarcerated People

Before one can plan a program for women in jails, one must be aware of the deprivation that is a reality of incarceration. Gresham Sykes, in his classic study *A Society of Captives*, wrote: "Subjected to prolonged material deprivation, lacking heterosexual relationships, and rubbed raw by the irritants of life under compression, *the inmate population is pushed in the direction of deviation from, rather than adherence to, the legal norms.*[1] Said ex-offender Marilyn Isabel, "It doesn't destroy anybody's tendency to want to go out and break the law; in fact, it makes you angry enough to want to go out and tear up the world."[2]

Many enlightened humanists of our day are calling incarceration "cruel and unusual" punishment in itself -- aside from any abuse or brutality that may occur in the institutions. Particularly for jailed inmates, the pain of incarceration is beyond what one could consider proportionate to the kind of crimes committed.

The total lack of personal privacy is overwhelming, with a constant monitoring, whether by electronic surveillance or by a correctional officer. Toilets are open to the view of anyone walking through the cell block. Showers are group facilities. You change your clothes, sleep, and perform your daily personal toilet in the presence of other inmates and guards.

There is evidence that women do not easily fit into groups and that consequently, incarceration is more upsetting for them than for men. The experience in the armed services seems to demonstrate that regimentation and group living are upsetting to women.[3]

Incarceration also strips the inmate of normal expressions of personhood -- the clothes you wear, your jewelry, your makeup, your style. Many jails provide uniforms, ranging from drab, ill-fitting dresses to jeans and sweatshirts, while some allow inmates to have a limited number of their own clothes. A person's anonymity within the system is enhanced by requiring institutional garb. Many prisons have not only dropped such requirements for inmates, but for staff as well.

If you're incarcerated, you also have severe limitations on your use and choice of personal and sanitary items. You buy, or are forced to borrow, shampoo, soap, toothpaste, and a myriad of other products. Too often, male-scented deodorants, shampoos, and soaps, such as Old Spice (all sold, not issued, by the jails), further humiliate female personal needs. You'll have to buy most toiletries, or go without. In some jails, you must use sanitary napkins rather than tampons, because of "security" reasons, and you also have to *ask* for them each month.

---

[1] Gresham M. Sykes, *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*, p. 22.

[2] *Women Behind Bars*, p. 14, from David Greenberg's "Anarcho-Marxist Criminology."

[3] "Brief on the Woman Offender," *Canadian Journal of Corrections*, p. 44.

If you're Black, or Polish, or Italian -- or any other ethnic group -- your stomach is going to have a hard time adjusting to the bland institutional food, loaded with starch. You have no choice in menu or when you eat, despite any dietary or religious preferences. There is a tendency on the part of the jails to telescope the timing of meals for administrative convenience, in order to complete the process during the day shift. Most meals are given between 7 a.m. and 4 p.m.[1] Jail administrators tend to refer to "feeding" times -- a phrase most of us relate to animals, not human beings. The focus is clearly on the perspective of the feeder, not the feedee.

You may be used to watching favorite television programs or listening to certain radio stations, but when you're in jail, you listen to the channel that the jail programs for you, or that the inmates select as a group. When television watching is one of the few "programs" for women in jail, even that is a nonprogram if you can't make individual selections.

You may have certain ways you like to decorate your place, with your personality reflected in crazy posters, colorful lights, or hanging plants, but when you're in jail, your surroundings cannot reflect your personality. The concrete walls and metal bars renounce any sense of "home" or identity. You'll be lucky to have plumbing and a private cell.

If you feel sick, you have no control over whether you will get health care. Generally, an untrained matron determines who will see the doctor during his or her hours. Specialists are often listed as "on call," but the decision to call them rests with an untrained person.[2]

You are denied any contact with people of the opposite sex. The inmate's "looking glass self" is only that part which is recognized by others of the same sex, creating for many a partial identity made hazy by the lack of contrast.[3] Your identity as a woman is validated only by other women, hardly a complete perspective considering it's a heterosexual world. This phenomenon of institutionalization placing psychosexual stress on the inmate occurs regardless of gender or class distinction. The prolonged denial of socially sanctioned sexual outlets, coupled with the disruption of marital and family relationships, contributes to the anxieties of any incarcerated person[4] -- a barrier to rehabilitation that could be bridged through the involvement of male volunteers or counselors.

Homosexuality becomes a real option for many inmates, though they may have been averse to such behavior on the outside. Several excellent studies, including Ward and Kasselbaum's *Women's Prison: Sex and Social Structure*, and Rise Giallombardo's *Society of Women: A Study of a Women's Prison*,

---

[1] Edith Flynn, "Jails and Criminal Justice," p. 69.

[2] Margery Velimesis, "Women in County Jails and Prisons," p. 7.

[3] Gresham Sykes, *Society of Captives*, p. 72.

[4] *Operational Plan for Family Planning Program*, Florida Division of Corrections, p. 4.

have attributed homosexuality among incarcerated women as being a more emotional need for support and closeness than a physical sexual expression. Male inmates may be more apt to engage in homosexual behavior as a power or physical response. Though women in jails are not as prone to homosexuality as they are in prison, it is still a very real adjustment to the state of incarceration.

Your body, which doctors and the law itself consider sacrosanct, will be subject to persistent invasion. Strip searches are common in jails, with rectal and vaginal examinations an integral part of the frequent searches for contraband. Upon admittance, you'll be sprayed with a foul disinfectant to kill lice present or not.

You'll be denied even the most rudimentary rights to make any independent decisions. You'll be told when to get up, what to wear, what to eat, how to act, when to speak, when to shower, when to sleep, what you're supposed to do every hour of the day. A staff member at one institution explained that the rules were intended to create discipline, and rehabilitation could be achieved through discipline. This is particularly disturbing, since most inmates in jails are pretrial detainees, and are not there for rehabilitation.[1]

If you choose not to relinquish your total independence, and act in a way that you consider responsible to yourself (i.e., question the rules, ask for things or services you need, try to make waves to improve conditions), you will be punished. You get rewarded for acting like an institutionalized robot, and punished for acting human. The irony is that the sense of independent responsibility that incarceration suppresses is the very ability that is most needed in terms of productive survival on the outside. Unfortunately, the probability of parole being granted is very much tied to how compliant you act.

For many offenders, jails function as a revolving door life sentence, with incarceration instilling and reinforcing values that are contrary to those needed to live productively on the outside -- values such as hostility to anyone in authority, a depressed sense of personal responsibility, a diminished sense of individuality and self-worth, the refinement of self-serving manipulation, the loss of a mature version of one's sexual identity, and a demeaned sense of the sanctity of one's own body. The pains of incarceration are immense, and can be long lasting.

In putting together a program plan for women in jails, one cannot help but question that such deprivation may be contrary to the rehabilitation efforts. George Bernard Shaw commented on the dichotomous punishment-treatment relationship, "To punish a [wo]man, you just injure [her]; to reform a [wo]man, you must improve [her]; and [wo]men are not improved by injuries."

---

[1] *Proposed Pennsylvania Criminal Justice Goals and Standards for Women*, p. 24.

Unique Problems for Women in Jail

While movies with exotic titles such as *Women in Chains* and *Women Behind Bars* portray incarcerated women as bull-dikes, nymphomaniacs, toughies, and mentally deranged human beings,[1] there has been a lack of any substantial information on the real needs and problems of women offenders.

A few surveys that have been conducted among incarcerated women suggest that their major concerns are their *children*, adequate *health care*, and *educational or job opportunities*.[2] Beyond the pains of incarceration, which all prisoners feel, women offenders face unique problems of femaleness that are not usually recognized or supported by the present criminal justice system -- all of which systematically break down women's sense of themselves, reinforcing submission, dependence, and powerlessness.

Children

The vast majority (80%) of women in jails have children. Though not all incarcerated mothers are responsible for their care at the time of arrest, 56.3% have children living with them. Black women are significantly more likely to take care of their children than are whites, Hispanics, or any other ethnic group, with black women three times more likely to be the sole support.[3]

Unlike men, who may have a woman on the outside to care for the children, women offenders lose their children temporarily or permanently by incarceration. There is usually no man in the picture to keep the family intact. When a woman is arrested -- despite statements by the police and local magistrates to the contrary -- the children may be alone for many hours before someone realizes that the mother is gone and friends or child welfare agencies are called. Instances are known of children under the age of five being alone for two days.[4]

Behind the pain of separation lies the ominous possibility that it may be permanent. According to a California survey of women offenders, 38% of incarcerated mothers lose custody of their daughters and sons.[5] Legislatures in five states (Florida, Illinois, Montana, New York, Wyoming) have

---

[1] Prior to the 1960s, Freud's perspective of women being inherently passive dominated everyone's explanation of women criminals as being maladjusted or deviant. Freud took women's subservience for granted, and independent behavior was regarded as mental illness.

[2] According to a study published by the Women's Prison Association in 1972, women at Riker's Island (N.Y.) wanted help in finding jobs more than any other form of assistance after release. Due to their lack of confidence in obtaining employment, the second most important need was help in applying for social service assistance.

[3] Ruth Glick, *National Study of Women's Correctional Programs*, pp. 116-118.

[4] Margery Velimesis, *Women in County Jails and Prison*, p. 2.

[5] *Women Behind Bars*, p. 6.

specifically designated that the mother's incarceration is sufficient in and of itself to terminate parental rights, and courts may allow adoption of the child without the mother's consent.[1]

When most offenders are released on parole, they are under the custody and supervision of their parole officers and are required to prove their fitness as a mother. Because of the lack of standards in determining parental fitness, the determination by the parole officers or the social agencies caring for the child may be arbitrary.[2]

Many people think that a woman has two socially acceptable roles in life: her relationship with men and her relationship with children. A woman who is incarcerated finds it very difficult to maintain her image as a woman, since she is stripped of all relations with men and children. Separation from her family, her husband or lover, and her children will cause the most pain. But the absence of privacy, the lack of a social life, and the complete removal of male companionship intensifies the impact of being locked away.[3]

How does a woman define herself, when she has no way of relating to herself in traditional female terms? The dispossession of the mother role may manifest itself in the development of a family structure among incarcerated women.[4] Homosexual relationships among women in jails and prisons fill a void with security and social status that helps them bear the emotional deprivations of institutionalization. Though homosexuality is not as prevalent in jails as it is in prisons, most administrators are quick to break up any pairing, without trying to understand the root needs. There is also little evidence to indicate that lesbianism persists after release.

The children of women offenders become the hidden victims of crime. The separation anxiety is just as intense for the children as it is for their mothers, when the family is split up and the children are placed in different foster homes.

While it has been common in "less progressive" countries[5] for women to be allowed contact with their children within the jail, this idea has fallen

---

[1] Richard D. Palmer, "The Prisoner-Mother and Her Child," *Capital University Law Review*, pp. 128-131.

[2] In cases where custody is denied, the woman is entitled to a family court hearing on the issue of fitness. Unfortunately, few women know about the right to a hearing.

[3] Being stripped of all traditional measures of womanliness may account for female offenders' overt hostility to feminism.

[4] Clorinda Margolies, "First Impressions in the House of Correction," p. 2.; Williams and Fish, *Convicts, Codes and Contraband*, p. 124.

[5] The Women's Prison in Venezuela houses all the country's pretrial and sentenced women, and allows mothers to keep their children with them. They perhaps recognize in a more basic way that children can be a strong motivating factor, and support that need, rather than suppress it.

on fallow ground in the United States. Few, if any, visiting privileges recognize the need of children and mothers to maintain regular contact. Plexiglass booths and austere visiting rooms make few concessions to the touching needs of both mother and child. Jail officials present the security argument that contraband could be smuggled into the institution in a baby's diaper, as well as propose the absurd moral notion that contact would contaminate the baby, as the mother has demonstrated her irresponsibility by committing a crime.[1]

Public officials, agencies that are mandated to represent these children, and the general public must be alerted to the impact of incarceration on both mother and child, and recognize the needs that both have as part of the rehabilitation program. Socially dysfunctional families impact on the next generation; conversely, economic and social rehabilitation may have a similar, positive multiplier effect.[2]

Health Problems

Besides the problems and needs of women in jails as mothers, female offenders also suffer special feminine health problems as a result of incarceration. Though jail administrators tend to see women as malingerers or hypochondriacs, gynecological problems are a frequent product of the physical and emotional stress.

Amenorrhea (missing periods), dysmenorrhea (painful periods), and a variety of other menstrual irregularities are common problems of women in correctional institutions.[3] Though insensitive jailers are quick to attribute it to the natural bitchiness of women, the stressful situation (combined with the starchy diet and lack of exercise) causes real psychogenic sexual dysfunctions that should be treated by a specialist. Unfortunately, jails rarely offer gynecological care, and lack of understanding of women's physical problems can become barriers to rehabilitation programs. The mandate for jails must be habilitation of inmates, as well as rehabilitation.

Obtaining necessary supplies for general feminine hygiene and menstrual periods, or obtaining care during pregnancy, places women in an awkwardly dependent position, especially in county jails where men are in charge of health services.

---

[1] Phyllis Baunach and Thomas Marton, *Women in Prison: An Awakening Minority*, p. 11.

[2] In 1971, the Women's Prison Association initiated the Children of the Offender Program to identify what happens to these children. Of 123 children studied, 93 were public charges, 11 were in institutions. Sixteen were born addicted; three are now known drug addicts and 11 have already been in conflict with the law. (From Omar Hendrix, *A Study in Neglect*, p. 8.)

[3] Edward Brecher and Richard Della Penna, *Health Care in Correctional Institutions*, p. 35.

Stigmas: Jobs and Training

Though the stigma attached to an ex-offender today is as heavy as the eighteenth century pillories, where the person was put on public display as a deviant, incarceration lays a special "ex-con" stigma on women. Crime has in it a curiously gratifying element of macho for a man: a hustler, a con, a hood. Though society is repelled by crime, it is less morally judgmental about male than female offenders. Criminal behavior confirms one's maleness; among women, it contradicts traditional sex-role stereotypes.

Women are in jail not because of some deviant streak in their personalities, but rather because of oppressive classism. It's hard enough for a well-educated, middle-class, white woman to obtain a decent paying, meaningful job; but for a poor black woman, it's damn near impossible. The problems of entry or reentry into the prevailing social structure pose many reality-based, rather than intrapsychic, difficulties.

Society lays a moral stigma on women offenders, which is reflected in their treatment within the jails, as well as outside. The discrimination occurs in programs, in employment, in child custody cases. The common myth is this: all women are "hookers" who will subvert jail staff, fellow employees, and their own children with their perverse sexuality. Nobody wants to admit it, but the sexuality issue is there. Even if a woman was arrested or convicted of a nonmoral charge, she is still lumped together into the common myth.

Jail officials repeatedly deny women inmates access to rehabilitative programs such as work release, defended on the basis of expense, administrative difficulties, or the "unsuitability" of women for work release. A nationwide tour of county jails revealed few women participating in work release programs,[1] despite the fact that women offenders are the most difficult group for whom to seek employment and could best benefit from the work release experience. Their participation is determined not by their threatened degree of violence, but by their deviance from the prescribed moral order. Where violent, dangerous males may be offered rehabilitation programs, women are denied equitable access to such programs. The problem is clearly in the attitudes of the jailers toward women -- paternalistic or moralistic -- rather than some inherent problem of the women themselves.

Ironically, women probably need social service programs in jails even more than men. Data on female offenders in Washington, D.C. (1973), showed that 69% of the women arrested were unemployed,[2] compared to 46% of the male arrestees.[3] Though unemployment statistics vary from one county to the next, the woman offender does have fewer opportunities for meaningful jobs

---

[1] Katherine Krause, "Denial of Work Release Programs for Women," p. 1458.

[2] L. Rans et al., *Demonstration Project: Alternative to Incarceration for the Woman Offender*, p. 24.

[3] Susan Katzenelson, *The Female Defendant in Washington, D.C.*, p. ii.

than her male counterpart after release, partially because of the stigma of being a "fallen woman," and partially from the discriminatory practices in jails that keep women out of meaningful job training programs.

Powerlessness

Perhaps the greatest problem is that women are powerless to precipitate change, in terms of their physical facilities, programs, or attitudes of their keepers. Women do not stage riots, and therefore, have been unable to garner community awareness to their needs and problems. Without the physical threat of violence, incarcerated women are stripped of any power to bring about jail reform.

If supportive services are to be implemented for women in jails, one must drop the myths, and deal with the real problems that femaleness imposes. Women endure the deprivation of imprisonment common to all inmates, but the extra pains are immense. Women offenders are confronted with many of the same issues -- discrimination, paternalism, etc. -- facing women in the community. As women inside and women outside collectively examine the discriminatory patterns and debunk the myths, we may find that the hand that rocks the cradle can also rock the boat.

Pretrial: Presumed Innocent

More than half the people in American jails -- 52% according to the *1970 National Jail Census* -- are pretrial detainees, held for trial because they can't post bail.[1] Unfortunately, the application of this principle of surety bond guaranteeing a person's appearance for trial is unfairly weighted toward those with the financial resources to raise the bail money. The poor are more likely to be penalized in a bail system, while the rich rarely see the inside of a jail.

Despite the Bail Reform Act of 1966,[2] which proposed minimum reliance on the financial condition of pretrial detainees, courts still freely apply the cash bond principle, with pretrial detention amounting to sentencing for the poor.

Keep in mind that the American system of justice presumes a person innocent until *proven* guilty. To deprive any accused defendant of his/her liberty without trial by jury is fundamentally in conflict with the basic American way of doing things.[3] Since more than half the women in jail are pretrial detainees, their being deprived of their rights (often more than sentenced offenders), violates presumption of innocence and the equal protection and due process clauses of the Constitution. Yet this presumption of innocence has little basis in the realities of pretrial detention. Let us look at the special hardships imposed on pretrial inmates:

1. Certain prejudices are obvious: a person in jail, unlike the counterpart who is free before trial, cannot consult with an attorney in the open and continuous way that would be possible to a person who was free before trial -- despite the Sixth Amendment's provision for the right to counsel. Rigidly enforced rules preclude unlimited phone calls, visitations, having access to legal references, or contacting witnesses for the case. A pretrial inmate is at the mercy of the keepers, who may or may not allow special provisions for the accused. The Eighth Amendment's right to reasonable bail is denied if visitors who come to arrange bail are not admitted at any reasonable hour.

2. One's status as a pretrial detainee is likely to bias the opinion of the judge and jury when one's case is heard. Walking into court through the special door for those being detained has a deleterious effect on those judging your innocence, versus freely walking into court with one's family and lawyer. Statistics from the Manhattan Bail Project show that 77% of those arrested for assault who were not jailed before trial were subsequently not convicted, while only 41% of those who were detained before trial were not convicted.[4]

---

[1] Ronald Goldfarb, *Jails*, p. 33.

[2] Public Law 89-465, 89th Congress, June 22, 1966, 80 Stat. 214.

[3] Ronald Goldfarb, *Jails*, p. 430.

[4] *Proposed Pennsylvania Criminal Justice Goals and Standards for Women*, p. 2.

3. If pretrial detainees are incarcerated because they cannot raise the money for bail, it is also likely they do not have the money for a private attorney. Despite the 1972 Supreme Court ruling (*Argersinger* v. *Hamlin*, 407 U.S. 25) that every poor person is entitled to a free lawyer, most defendants with court-appointed attorneys are not satisfied with the services rendered. Nearly 70% of the 135 men and women surveyed by the American Friends Service Committee in Washington, D.C., on July 15, 1973, felt their lawyers had not spent sufficient time on their cases and were not satisfied with their attorney's work. Inasmuch as a defendant's opinion of whether sufficient time was spent on his/her case is a key element in that person's sense of justice received, an attorney's time spent well can eliminate many of the frustrations that cause defendants in jail awaiting trial to become embittered.[1] The D.C. survey also revealed that 13.7% of the men and women on pretrial status did not even know their lawyer's name. If a person in jail has confidence in the attorney, a good deal of the stress may be diminished; if the person doesn't even know the lawyer's name, and feels his/her case is inadequately prepared, the anxiety levels are going to override any rehabilitative attempts. Studies have confirmed that public defenders and assigned counsel plead their clients guilty more often, and that these clients tend to be convicted more often and receive longer sentences.[2] Plea bargaining is used as a tool to expedite cases through the courts, without regard for guilt or innocence; inmate gaming is reinforced.

4. Sentencing law provides that time spent in pretrial detention shall be credited toward the eventual sentence. But, for those later acquitted. there is no redemption or compensation for the time spent in jail before trial. The hardships of losing one's job, breaking up the family, suffering the indignities and deprivation of incarceration are chalked up to another burden of being poor.

5. Pretrial detainees cannot work while they are in jail, though many are often incarcerated for prolonged periods. It is not unusual for men and women to wait months before going to trial.[3] They are prevented from participating in programs available to sentenced offenders on the ground that it would be unfair and illegal to force a person to work if she/he is not convicted of a crime and serving a sentence. A closer look at the issue reveals that many pretrial detainees would participate voluntarily in such programs if they were offered. Some seek relief from the boredom, others hope to obtain favorable recommendations to the judiciary. Others sincerely would welcome the development of meaningful economic options. It appears that those administrators who wish to provide programs to pretrial detainees do so successfully on a voluntary basis, while those who do not hide under the smokescreen of constitutional questions.[4]

---

[1] American Friends Service Committee, *Waiting in Jail*, p. 39.

[2] Hans Mattick, "Contemporary Jails," p. 781.

[3] The question remains whether incarcerated defendants know and understand that they can exercise their *right* to a speedy trial.

[4] Edith E. Flynn, "Jails and Criminal Justice," pp. 70-71.

The supreme irony is that the "innocent" inmates are treated as if they are guilty, and in many cases, denied even those basic services afforded to sentenced offenders. Though many jailers are quick to defend the extra security toward pretrial inmates on the grounds that they are "highly emotional" and apt to "act out," the additional stresses caused by the nature of pretrial detention contribute to, rather than stabilize, the person's anxiety. Class action suits across the country are arguing that the aggregate conditions in jails constitute cruel and unusual punishment to pretrial detainees, violating the presumption of innocence, equal protection, and due process clauses of the Constitution.[1]

The most basic traditional assumption about pretrial bail -- that surety bond is the best method of assuring appearance -- is highly suspect. Many experimental programs nationwide have underscored this doubt, and release on one's promise that she/he will reappear has proven even more effective than surety release,[2] 2% vs. 5-8% under traditional bail procedures. It is also a step toward equalizing the treatment between rich and poor defendants, with release being determined by one's likelihood to show up, not on the basis of one's economic status.

In Albuquerque and Tulsa, active third party custody programs are run by lawyers, with the courts releasing defendants into the custody of clergy, family friends, employers, or attorneys. Similar programs are run in Washington, D.C., where ex-convicts run the Bonabond program; in Chicago, where the Alliance to End Repression supplements the local court-based release program; in Los Angeles, through the HEW-funded Community Justice Program. Other programs across the country are similarly trying innovative release programs, combined with pretrial community services.

One component of the Des Mones Project, "Release with Services," focuses on the accused offender's problems. The purpose of this program is to obtain an accused offender's release, then assist him/her in correcting social or vocational problems during the period before trial -- a time span that averages about three months.[3] Release is determined by a range of criteria, including one's tenure in the community, seriousness of the crime, receptivity to rehabilitation programs, etc., rather than by the bail system's reliance on economic measures. With release granted on the presumption that one is not apt to run, the accused can sustain family structure, jobs, and contact with legal counsel -- and at the same time, undertake any additional social services (counseling, vocational training, education) that might be indicated. These pretrial release programs, though few in number, have indicated that the poor are not more likely to run than are the rich under the bail system.

In planning programs for women in jails, one cannot overlook the needs and problems of those on pretrial status, and focus on equalizing programs for

---

[1] Ronald Goldfarb, *Jails*, p. 404.

[2] Bruce Beaudin, *How to Implement Criminal Justice Standards for Pretrial Release*, pp. 3-4.

[3] Rob Wilson, "Replicating LEAA's First Exemplary Project," *Corrections Magazine*, September 1976, p. 17.

pretrial and sentenced inmates, or establishing a pretrial release with services component. The majority of jails do not separate their sentenced and pretrial female inmates, though they are legally required to do so. The high cost and small female population are frequently cited reasons. The result is that both groups suffer. With single staff coverage the norm in the women's unit, the worst rules applicable to each group end up straitjacketing both types of inmates. Where pretrail inmates should have unlimited phone calls, the limitations imposed for sentenced offenders become the rule of the unit. Where sentenced offenders should have the opportunity for rehabilitation programs, the pretrial detainees cannot "legally" participate, and the combination effectively eliminates the program.[1] Men's units are usually more highly populated, with classification of inmates into different sections, and treatment therefore somewhat more flexible.

We look to a time when economic means will not be the test of one's eligibility for release before trial, when all defendants not found by due process to be dangerous to the community will be released on unsecured appearance bond, when pretrial incarceration will only follow a thorough assessment of one's unlikelihood or failure to appear.

The few women who inevitably would be detained must be allowed to maintain their ordinary lifestyle to the fullest extent possible. They should have unrestricted access to all forms of communications at all times, including telephone and correspondence free of censorship. They should be free to dress as they choose. They should have free access to competent medical personnel and legal counsel, and contact with family, children, and friends. *The only restrictions should be those that relate directly to assuring their appearance in court.*

Where the community has determined that pretrial incarceration is necessary to protect its safety, it should assume the additional costs necessary to provide the full civil and human rights of the jailed defendant as a citizen detained pending trial.[2]

Whether you are successful in developing a pretrial release program, or improving in-house legal services, the needs of pretrial women must be addressed. The justification for a woman's pretrial detention is uppermost in her mind, before any rehabilitation considerations. She doesn't know how long she'll be detained, she doesn't know what is going to happen to her kids, she doesn't know how she's going to pay the bills while she's awaiting trial. These and many other very basic concerns provoke extreme anxiety in pretrial women, and supportive services may mean helping a woman solve her immediate problems -- the problems of getting out, and/or getting a fair hearing in court -- before she is ready to focus on educational or vocational rehabilitation.

---

[1] Mixing pretrial and sentenced women provokes hostility among both classes of inmates, and tension consistently runs high. They blame each other, rather than focusing on the system that sets them up.

[2] American Friends Service Committee, *Waiting in Jail*, pp. 50-51.

2. Programs

Having identified the public's biased moral condemnation of women who have violated society's values and norms, we must now proceed to rechannel these cases into more appropriate human service agencies, thereby providing relief to overburdened correctional systems and a more equitable administration of justice.

Edith Elisabeth Flynn

The Special Problems of Female Offenders

Rehabilitating

Tests may "conclude" that a particular person is hopeless, and psychiatrists and social workers may give up on rehabilitation efforts. A nonprofessional with an eighth grade education may not know the person is hopeless, and provide precisely the kind of unbiased listening support the person needs.

Joe Alex Morris, *First Offender*

Self-Esteem

Many administrators of jails have been unaware and ill-informed of the needs, problems, and demographics of the women offenders in their institutions, and as a result, their posture to this offender group has been full of assumptions that are based on misconceptions.

In understanding women in jails, the issue of their self-esteem must be addressed. It is not entirely a separate issue apart from women's feelings about themselves generally. This culture has reinforced traditional roles of dependency and passivity, and women offenders must not only cope with those issues, but also the stigma of being a "fallen woman."

Contemporary social thinking is beginning to interpret women's criminal behavior in the context of their socioeconomic conditions, rather than in psychological terms. If women are "criminals" because they lack the education and skills to respond otherwise, the treatment mode is mandated to:

1. address the women's feelings about themselves;

2. design flexible programs allowing room for inmates to make mistakes as they function independently;

3. assist the offenders to move away from dependency on social workers or the structure of the institution itself.

Let's look at each of these areas.

Though most ex-offenders want to find an honest means of making a living, they suffer from the feeling of desperation that comes from seeing no light at the end of the tunnel.[1] They've been around the track before, and feelings of worthlessness have been reinforced inside and outside the institutions. For women, the pattern of criminality often begins during adolescence, with 35% of adult offenders having had contact with juvenile courts.[2] The early years are often viewed as the crucible of crime. Broken homes,[3] disorganized families, poverty, and family neglect are social factors that have contributed to delinquency and criminality. Without positive reinforcement at home, the adolescent turns to support from peers on the streets. Illicit sex frequently leads to unplanned pregnancies, followed by welfare dependency and/or sex for money.

"I think all my troubles started when I was 17," said Berties. "Some dude, I don't know who, knocked me up and I had to quit school to have the baby. Soon after the baby was born, my father put us out of the house. He was a religious nut and didn't want a sinner like me living under his roof. I went on welfare. Pretty soon, I found I couldn't make it on welfare. That's

---

[1] John Armore, *Dictionary of Desperation*, p. 7.

[2] Margery Velimesis, *Women in County Jails and Prisons*, p. 3.

[3] According to Ruth Glick's *National Study of Women's Correctional Programs* (pp. 123-126), 49.5% of women studied came from one-parent families (predominantly mother dominated), or lived with other relatives; 3.6% were raised in foster homes.

when Harold entered the picture. He tole me I could make $75 on weekends as a go-go dancer. After I did that for a couple of months, Harold asked me if I wanted to make an extra $50 after the club closed. I had sex with this guy, and that's when I became a prostitute. Harold kept lining me up with customers and I was making between two and three bills every weekend by the time I was 18. But you know something? I never even saw most of that money. Harold kept it. It never occurred to me that he was using my money to make payments on his Cadillac. It never occurred to me that I was paying the rent for his apartment."[1]

Most incarcerated women are poor, and the feminist movement has had little impact. They are still less confident than males in coping with socio-economic demands.[2] They still feel strong role pressure as women in the traditional sense, and act out to men deferentially.

The Bucks County (Penn.) Jail "Imaginal Education" Program conducts group counseling sessions, based on the theory that criminal behavior is the result of poor self-image, which leads the offender to believe she/he is the victim of circumstances, rather than the creator of them. The unfortunate fact still remains, however, that most offenders are victims of poverty, broken homes, and neglect. Considering their circumstances, offenders have created "opportunities," though not in a mainstream sense. The challenge is to introduce a range of new opportunities.

Though enriching self-esteem is a vital concomitant to educational and skills training, one cannot divorce changing role patterns of the woman from the expectations of her family and peers. When a woman offender obtains a meaningful job, her dependency on the men in her life is going to change, a phenomenon that may threaten the stability of the male-dominated household. For this reason, expectations that rehabilitation ends upon parole are fallacious; in some ways, the deep social reorientation is just beginning, and intensive aftercare support will also be needed.

A second concern in dealing with self-esteem is the issue of failure. Most jail systems are so highly structured they do not allow the inmate any room to make mistakes. Mistakes are punished, and women offenders' manipulative and conning behavior is reinforced in the rigid system. The heavy authoritarian orientation denies independent decision making and conflict resolution, precisely the abilities that are needed on the outside to function productively. The system reinforces obedience and passivity. Where persuasion replaces force, authority may have a positive influence in helping the inmate grow. Where coercion is highest, alienation is most pronounced.[3]

---

[1] Norman Hayes, *Lady in a Cage*, pp. 2-3.

[2] Based on a study of 128 males and 128 females at the N.C. Correctional System, given comparative MMPI tests. James Panton, "Personality Difference Between Male and Female Prison Inmates," in Annette Brodsky's *The Female Offender*, pp. 42-43.

[3] John Conrad, "Reintegration: Practice in Search of a Theory," *Reintegration of the Offender into the Community*, pp. 16-17.

A basic premise of the PI House Community Correctional Center for Women in St. Paul, Minnesota, is that clients must be allowed as much freedom as they can handle in order to experiment with new behavior and learn to make decisions. It is felt that while some of the clients' plans and approaches will undoubtedly fail, these failures can be turned into positive learning experiences with the assistance of the project staff.[1] Replacing a highly structured security system with a highly structured treatment program still sharply delimits inmate behavior, maintaining the institutional dependency, without developing independent coping mechanisms or ways of dealing with conflict or failure.

The Purdy Treatment Center in Tacoma, Washington, reinforces individual responsibility, with an alarm clock issued to each woman to help her plan her own daily schedule; recidivism at Purdy is an astonishingly low 3%.

Marcia Hovey calls for the system to develop a "tolerance factor,"[2] as we allow teenagers working at their first jobs. Women in jails have not adapted successfully to normative society in the past, and it is unrealistic to expect immediate conformity to mainstream values from someone who has had very limited positive experience. We would allow a little leeway to teenagers for them to make mistakes, and learn from them. The same should apply to women offenders, who may be adults in age, but are inexperienced in dealing with the "straight" world. If the jail system is set up to maximize the opportunities for being responsible for their own actions (within a reasonable context), that independence and assertiveness may carry over to the outside world.

Our third concern as regards self-esteem is that of dependency. Though some social workers inherently like the role because of its reinforcement to their own self-worth, creating emotional dependency only serves the social worker, not the offender. The supportive function cannot be confused with that of dependency. Helping a woman make her own decisions regarding life planning is far more effective than doing everything for her, then blaming her when she can't make it on the outside.

Every person has a basic dignity. Women offenders' sense of frustration, their feelings of being victimized, and their sense of powerlessness are, in some ways, common to all women. Though offenders' responses to those feelings have been to behave criminally, rehabilitation programs must be sensitive to the low self-esteem of women everywhere. Women in jail are not mentally deranged human beings: their survival mechanisms have been appropriate to their socioeconomic cultural situation. That women offenders are at the bottom is more a result of our reinforcing that hierarchy than it is of some inherent inferiority. Due to our society's uncultural, dominant value system, many women have not had access to either the means or the ends, and have adapted to alternative cultural lifestyles or resorted to deviant modes of acquiring the coveted social success goals.

---

[1] Minnesota-PI House, Inc., Community Correction Center for Women, *A Preliminary Evaluation Report*, p. 6.

[2] Marcia Hovey, "The Forgotten Offenders," p. 41.

[3] Laurence French and Kathy Hyatt, "Incarceration as a Mechanism of Social Discrimination," p. 6.

The empowerment of women must address the psychological addiction to self-denigration, which women are socially conditioned to accept. If such utterly self-destructive behavior is urged upon us, it is because our society is bent upon destroying something in its females, destroying their ego, their self-respect, their hope, their optimism, their imagination, their self-confidence, their will.[1] These qualities must be positively reinforced if the efforts of educational and vocational rehabilitation are to take effect.

---

[1] Kate Millett, *The Prostitution Papers*, pp. 96-97.

Intake and Needs Assessment

The vast majority of jails collect only the most basic, court-related information on their women inmates. With no information on what the individual women's needs and problems are, it is no wonder that so few programs exist for women in jails and that recidivism remains consistently high.

The few jails that do intake in the women's unit generally collect data only on the sentenced population. In assessing your own institution's system, keep in mind that the women arraigned in the local courts, and the women held on detention status before trial, represent the significant bulk of women in the criminal justice system. To develop intake information (and thereby programs) on sentenced women only is to validate the institutional system. Given the nature of women offenders, your goal should be deinstitutionalization of as many of the women as possible.[1]

Nassau County (NY) has developed "Operation Midway" for offenders 16-25 years of age, to begin counseling before trial, in areas of family, jobs, and training needs. Like the model Des Moines Project, it is one of the few that coordinates all phases of the criminal justice system.

This coordination is important if you plan to work with arraignees and those on pretrial status. Judges generally know very little about women's needs, yet recognize the need for resources as alternatives to incarceration. Referrals to your program might be the alternative judges are looking for, if you can give the court reasonable assurance of your commitment and responsible approach.

For those women who are incarcerated, problems and needs will vary for pretrial and sentenced inmates.

Pretrial women face certain problems and anxieties because of the sudden disruption in their lives, which most admission processes fail to adequately deal with. A woman who is "presumed innocent" deserves to know how her children will be cared for, where she can get her medication, how she can get her clothes, when she can see her lawyer, and what her chances are for bail or a speedy trial. Correctional institutions are overly inclined to treat such anxieties as insignificant, thereby further enraging an already distraught woman.

The framework for sequencing in working with women should be based partially on Maslow's hierarchy of needs. The security of basic needs must be assured before a person can be expected to participate in rehabilitation programs.

One organization that effectively addresses those immediate needs is the Visitors Services Center in Washington, D.C. Volunteers from the community handle 900 requests per month from the D.C. Jails and Lorton Reformatory --

---

[1] Nancy Crisman, "Female Offenders," p. 13.

checking on the condition of a hospitalized father, picking up false teeth left behind, tracking down a comfortable pair of sneakers, calling a hard-to-find lawyer -- to help solve some of those matters left unresolved upon incarceration.

Intake interviews on pretrial women should, therefore, cover: (a) the issues that are of immediate concern to them; and (b) rehabilitative needs. Before a woman can concentrate on a battery of tests or probing questions, she needs to know her own immediate worries are given sympathetic attention. Again, pretrial detainees have not been convicted of anything, and are entitled to dignified support while awaiting bail or trial.

While the interview on immediate needs should be conducted immediately upon admission (within 24 hours), the interview on educational/vocational needs should wait until the woman has seen some concrete attention given to her personal problems.

Areas that should be covered in a comprehensive intake interview include: (a) current charges, court dates, lawyer's name and phone number, disposition of the case, previous arrest or conviction record; (b) family information, children (including their ages, schooling, who is now caring for them), background on husband or boyfriend, relationship with parents, siblings, or other close relatives; (c) health records, including drug or alcohol addiction, diseases, doctors, medications; (d) educational background, schools attended, last grade completed, classes of special interest, best subjects, reading and math levels; (e) job history, vocational training, skills used in work situations, attitudes toward jobs held, salaries received. An excellent intake form has been developed by the Women's Offenders' Services Bureau of the Lucas County Sheriff's Department, assessing 13 areas for potential rehabilitative services.

Psychological and intelligence tests may be conducted, but always from the perspective that the woman has certain inherent strengths and interests, and needs help in activating them constructively. Also keep in mind the strain of incarceration itself; she may not be able to score higher on tests than her intelligence would allow, but she may score much lower.[1] Perhaps the most crucial criticism of tests is that they will not give any information about the obstacles and opportunities facing a woman when she is released.

The purpose of collecting all this information on each woman is not to meet all the needs within the institution, but to recruit resources within the community to provide services. Only the few big city jails in this country can realistically offer the full range of programs themselves, and even there, the square-peg-in-the-round-hold phenomenon is likely to occur. The women inmates are infinitely variable human beings, with a specific battery of interests and needs.

A distinct advantage of developing a collaborated service delivery system is that by utilizing representatives of outside agencies as well as volun-

---

[1] Clorinda Margolies, "First Impressions," p. 2.

teers and students, different people can elicit the same general information from women inmates. Though only the intake interview would be formally constructed, relationships with various staff, correctional officers, and community people may offer different perspectives on the women's needs[1] and strengths.

Dr. Billy B. Sharp, a consulting psychologist with Combined Insurance Co. of America, has developed an Achievement Motivation Program built on the belief that everyone has solid strengths that may be unidentified and unused.[2] Though women offenders are typically categorized as without marketable skills, each woman does have strengths, which, if identified, might be more constructively channeled. It does take human relations skills to be a prostitute, just as it takes a planning ability to shoplift or write a bad check. Women offenders are not without strengths, but the social order has denied them access to the meaningful channels for expression.

As staff and volunteers work with women inmates to help them assess their own strengths, together they can determine realistic postrelease expectations: how much money the woman will need to support herself and her children, what kinds of jobs will match her strengths and interests with the job market, the extent of educational and vocational training and time required.

The important factor is that women participate actively in developing their program plan. From Attica we learned how impossible it is to administer institutions when inmates withhold their compliance[3] and programs that fail to address individual needs are doomed to noninvolvement by the women. The development of "inmate counsels" is also recommended, to insure the relevancy, support, and ongoing evaluation of programs offered. By helping women see they can plan and control their own lives, negative inmate energy can be diverted.

Where one woman may need basic survival skills and literacy tutoring, another may need GED preparation and vocational guidance. It cannot be assumed that each woman is at the same level of skills, interests, and needs. Reassessment should be an integral part of a program plan, to redefine previously stated goals when necessary, and reinforcement should be offered for her own level of progress.

The Community Re-entry Program in Howell, Michigan, epitomizes the effectiveness of a thorough intake process. Tailor-made, individualized programs are developed for each woman (and man), tying in with community agencies for specific long-term needs. A strong follow-up system offers the inmates guidance back into the community.

---

[1] Frederick E. Menz, "Program Evaluation in Rehabilitation Facilities," p. 13.

[2] "Help for the Woman Breadwinner," *Manpower*, p. 11.

[3] David J. Rothman, "History of Prisons, Asylums, and Other Decaying Institutions," *Prisoners Rights Sourcebook*, p. 16.

The effectiveness of any program rests on the intake process, for women's individual needs cannot be met and strengths developed until they are defined. If we begin to view women offenders as persons who have made fairly logical responses to situations in their lives -- responses that are made on the basis of their own limited experience (which is all any of us can ever do) rather than as criminals who have deliberately set out to break our laws -- we may then achieve a more fair and humane system, a minimal amount of recidivism, and a large reduction in crime.[1]

---

[1] Margery L. Velimesis, "The Female Offender," *Crime and Delinquency Literature*, p. 19.

RESOURCES

"Operation Midway," Nassau County, P.O. Box 172, East Meadow, New York 11554.

Visitors Services Center, 1422 Massachusetts Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003.

Dr. Billy Sharp, Achievement Motivation Program, c/o W. Clement & Jessie V. Stone Foundation, 111 East Wacker Drive, Suite 510, Chicago, Illinois 60601.

Women Offenders Services Bureau of the Lucas County Sheriff's Department, 1622 Spielbusch, Toledo, Ohio 43624.

Community Re-entry Program, Livingston County Sheriff's Department, 1503 Highlander Way, Howell, Michigan 48843.

Health

Women in jails are chronically undiagnosed (and untreated) health cases, developed over a lifetime of poor nutrition and poor preventive care. From rotting teeth to venereal disease, the health problems become barriers to rehabilitation, and habilitation must be an integral part of program planning.

Despite the fact that more than half the jails in this country report medical facilities, the services for women are traditionally inequitably available. In 1975, medical services for women inmates at the Monroe County Jail (N.Y.) were challenged in *Cooper* v. *Morin* at the New York State Supreme Court. The class action suit alleged that the jail failed to provide health services equitably to women inmates. In April 1976, Justice Edward Provenzano ordered the jail to make medical personnel available to women, regularly schedule sick call, conduct physical examinations (within 72 hours of admission), provide unfettered access to outside specialists, and conduct an overall study of the medical care delivery system at the institution.

Jails have not made medical services available to women for a variety of reasons: (a) women's special health problems are not understood by the primarily male administration; (b) the jail doctor's time is consumed with the larger male population; (c) specialists' services are too expensive to contract.

The above problems can be countered with the involvement of outside health agencies, whose primary mission is health. By soliciting the services of your local county health department or medical clinic, health services, planning, and inspection would be free from the political considerations so common to jails. Services could be donated or paid through Medicaid. In Massachusetts, the Department of Mental Health has a Division of Legal Medicine that provides diagnostic and clinical services to the courts and correctional agencies both on an inpatient and outpatient basis.

Specially deputized volunteers could provide transportation to outside doctors and clinics, particularly appropriate to those jails with no physical space for examinations. Larger jails should set aside a hospital room, with equipment donations solicited from the local hospitals.

Jails with the financial resources to provide direct services should investigate the use of medical technical assistants in the women's unit, similar to the system developed by the U.S. Bureau of Prisons. These personnel could assist the physician by conducting sick calls, giving emergency care, dispensing pharmaceuticals, providing dental care and physical therapy.[1] Institutions have found that better and more efficient care is given through triage and other screening services performed by allied health personnel, than when correctional officers provide this function.

---

[1] *The Use of Allied Health Personnel in Jails*, American Medical Association, p. 4.

However, it is strongly recommended that all correctional officers participate in a first aid course, such as that offered by local chapters of the American Red Cross.

Whether performed within the jail, or at an outside clinic, physical examinations should be offered to all women (pretrial and sentenced) including: blood pressure, temperature, pulse, visual inspection for trauma, drug use, communicable diseases, blood tests, audiology and tuberculosis skin test, chest x ray, gonorrhea test and Pap smear, and complete medical history. Such exams should be given within 72 hours of admission.

The release of one woman inmate with an undiagnosed, untreated infection or disease may be followed by scores of subsequent infections on the outside. Experience has shown that a dollar spent in case-finding may save hundreds of dollars in subsequent community costs for the long-term care of chronic disease and disability.[1] Diagnosis and treatment must, therefore, be available to pretrial as well as sentenced inmates.

Problems of drug abuse and alcoholism must be addressed, though no jail program can forestall the possibility of relapse and readdiction on release. Addicts are best helped by community-based programs, started *during* incarceration and *continued* after release.[2] Prerelease community methadone programs are successfully offered at the New Orleans Parish Prison and the Hartford State Jail in Connecticut, underscoring the viability of jails addressing addiction problems as part of a total rehabilitation program. Similarly, women alcoholics may be offered participation in a chapter of Alcoholics Anonymous within the women's unit, or coed with the male inmates, as the Oakland County (Michigan) Jail has recently implemented, or on an outreach basis to outside meeting sites. Health and addiction problems are as much community problems as they are correctional, and the collaboration of the various facets of the criminal justice system with allied agencies will facilitate the women's habilitation.

Besides developing physical examinations, daily sick call, allied health or outside agency participation, and donations of equipment and supplies for the women's unit, your program should also focus on preventative health care and an educational component.

Such an educational program should include: nutrition, diet, cooking, where and when to get free or inexpensive dental care and regular Pap smears, or prenatal care, and most basically, information on their own bodies.

The majority of women inmates come from backgrounds where opportunities to receive adequate sex education, either through formal or informal channels, were negligible. Rampant ignorance and misunderstanding abound about physical anatomy and reproductive processes, and the lack of knowledge about birth control methods is evidenced in the number of unplanned (and often unwanted) children.

---

[1] Edward M. Brecher & Richard D. Della Penna, "Health Care in Correctional Institutions," pp. 33-41.

[2] Ronald Goldfarb, *Jails*, p. 189.

Since 1974, the Florida Correctional Institution for women has permantly integrated a 20-hour Family Planning and Human Sexuality section in the Adult Basic Education Curriculum. Additionally, women leaving the institution or going on furloughs are given a choice of the following options: free 90-day supply of birth control pills, a free diaphragm fitting, a free I.U.D. insertion -- on a voluntary basis.[1] Inasmuch as sexual contact should be anticipated in work release situations, birth control devices should also be offered to women holding jobs or attending school while incarcerated.

Considering the relatively small number of women to be served, county health departments and family planning clinics should have no problem in donating contraceptive supplies for women inmates, and their direct support should be solicited.

A complete prepackaged health and sex education course is commercially available from Grady Memorial Hospital in Atlanta, Georgia. Entitled "Sex and Self: A Health Course for Women," the course is designed for group instruction, with slides covering the anatomy and physiology of reproduction, childbirth problems, birth control, and sexuality. Field-tested at the Women's Work Release Center in Atlanta and at the Georgia State Women's Prison in Milledgeville, the packaged course includes: a 171-page course curriculum (with teaching tips so any social worker, correctional officer, or volunteer could lead small group sessions), 72 slides, samples of various birth control methods, including a plastic speculum, I.U.D. and inserter, two packages of birth control pills, diaphragm kit, three condoms, two bottles of foam, and numerous simply printed brochures and handouts. Your local family planning clinic may be able to donate a similar package of supplies, though the Grady Hospital curriculum is invaluable when in-house staff are to be used as facilitators.

Good health is concomitant with rehabilitation. A woman with untreated physical problems, and no knowledge of resources or preventive care, is destined to become a chronically sick employee. She is also going to overlook her children's health needs, raising another malnourished, pathological generation who are really disguised health and welfare cases.

---

[1] *Fiscal Year 1974-75, Operational Plan for Family Planning Program,* p. 4.

RESOURCES

Cooper v. *Morin* legal brief and consent order available from Monroe County Legal Assistance Corp., 80 West Main St., Rochester, New York 14614.

Information on the use of Medical Technical Assistants is available through the Bureau of Prisons, Central Office, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20534. The American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, can similarly provide guidance in the use of allied health personnel in jails.

Florida's Family Planning Curriculum is available from the Florida Division of Corrections, Department of Health and Rehabilitation Services, Tallahassee, Florida 32301.

"Sex and Self: A Health Course for Women" is available from Grady Memorial Hospital, P.O. Box 26069, 80 Butler Avenue, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

AA Program: Sheriff's Department, Oakland County, 1201 North Telegraph Road, Pontiac, Michigan 48053.

Children

When a woman is incarcerated in jail, her children become the innocent victims, particularly when the woman is held on pretrial status. The jailed mother doesn't stop loving her children, nor do they stop loving her; however, children are abruptly uprooted and placed in foster homes, institutions, or with relatives. A 1964 study at the California Institution for Women revealed that 56% of the children were also separated from their brothers and sisters,[1] to further break up the family unit.

Without consistent maternal attention, the children have difficulty forming attachments with other people, and respond with antisocial behavior. One study of foster homes found that 40%-50% of the children showed symptoms of maladjustment.[2] The broken homes contribute to delinquency: more than half the women in jails today did not live in their own homes when they were children.[3]

No study has determined the rehabilitative effect of mother-child-contact. However, there is evidence to suggest that men who maintain contact with family and friends have a significantly greater rate of success on parole.[4]

In 1972 a federal court in Ohio ordered jail officials to implement a visiting program to increase the hours and remove the limitations on visits by children (*Jones* v. *Wittenberg, Jones* v. *Metzger*).[5]

Jails traditionally forbid or delimit the opportunities for mother-child visiting, and contact visits should be implemented on a regular basis. This means no plexiglass, or telephones, or tables between them. Contact visits give the imprisoned mother and disoriented child a chance to touch and hug and love each other in a relaxed atmosphere. The meetings might be arranged in a separate room; the chapel, if one exists, would minimize the fright that a child might feel in a heavily guarded setting.

Besides relaxing the security requirements for visiting between mother and child, special children's day events should also be planned. The Women's Detention Center in Washington, D.C., sponsors Family Day twice a year, with nearly 100 children and their mothers participating in a day of special activities. Such programs give the women inmates a chance to give to their children, a normal response to motherhood that imprisoned women are ordinarily denied. By planning the day, baking, making decorations, sending the child home with a hand-crafted gift, the women can reaffirm the normal instinct of motherhood.

---

[1] *Community Programs for Women: Cost and Economic Considerations*, p. 18.

[2] Ibid., p. 14.

[3] *Children of Women Offenders Report, 1974-1975*, p. 1.

[4] *Explorations in Inmate Family Relations*, Research Division, Department of Correction, State of California, January 1972, Report #46, p. vii.

[5] Nancy Crisman, "Female Offenders," p. 9.

The Female Offender Program of the Springfield (Mass.) YWCA offers a special program for mothers at the Hampden County Jail. Women and their children meet weekly at the YWCA, to talk, play, and learn together. A special program directs the attention of mother and child to better communication regarding their present situation -- with games, storytelling, reading, and talking about relevant topics.

The Bucks County (Penn.) Jail prisoner mothers are permitted to return home for a specified number of hours each day to care for their children, as an option in the work release program. The program recognizes the inherent problems of separating mother from child, and encourages the rebuilding of the family unit as a rehabilitation goal.

Women who are incarcerated for several months, often leaving an infant in the care of strangers, will develop unrealistic expectations about motherhood. Several programs are addressing the need for more effective parenting techniques among incarcerated women, recognizing that most inmates lacked effective role models in their own mothers.

A group of volunteers from the Family Life Education Department of Family and Children's Services in Minneapolis conducts a mothers' discussion group for women at the Women's Detention Center in Plymouth, Minnesota. The discussions help mothers cope with their separation from families, and the problems of rejoining their families upon release. Outside speakers help women understand their child's feelings of rejection and anxiety, and discuss how mothers may explain incarceration to their children.

Similarly, the "Mothers in Prison Project" of the American Friends Service Committee in Chicago teaches effective parenting, as well as keeps mothers and children in touch with each other through phone calls and home visits by their community volunteers. The program also aims to prevent court intervention, neglect hearings, and, most important, loss of custody. A woman in jail may lose her job, her car, her apartment, her furniture, but her kids are something different. She can't just say, "I'll get some more someday." Programs that address the women's needs as mothers may have a secondary effect of favorably influencing the judge in custody hearings.

In Tampa, Florida, the Offender Family Crisis Intervention Program offers counseling and referrals for inmates and their children. During the initial classification process of the Hillsborough County Jail, women are asked about any present or anticipated family problems. OFCIP counsels mothers and kids, making outside referrals when necessary. The program follows each family for three months after release, then makes another contact at six months and twelve months. Their objective is to reduce recidivism and stabilize the family unit, by helping both sides cope with the pain of incarceration and adjustments after release.

Prison Families Anonymous in New York is one of the few programs nationwide that deals with the needs of the children left behind. They solicit donations for Christmas presents and Easter baskets, facilitate Prison Children Anonymous for kids to share their feelings of guilt, hatred, and

shame at having a prisoner parent, and provide transportation for families to visit the jailed parent, focusing on the various adjustment needs of offenders' shattered families. More community agencies need to address the fears of inadequacy, the anger at separation, and the adjustments in developing a new lifestyle. Not only should this be done for the mothers' peace of mind, but to help mother and child work through the problems after release.

It is essential that agencies working with offenders recognize that the problems of the family are the problems of the offender also. Foster parents or relatives caring for a woman's children need to be informed in writing (bilingual brochures are recommended) as to visiting regulations, how to get to the jail, what must be done to write to the incarcerated woman, what the regulations are on sending packages, transferring money, and where they can turn for help.

Programs to meet the needs of mothers and their children can be implemented by paid staff, outside agencies, or concerned volunteers; the methodology is less important than understanding that jailed mothers worry about their children and lack effective parental training. The offenders' families will have a strong effect on their postrelease behavior.

The natural family unit must be preserved and enriched if we are to prevent the children from becoming the hidden victims of crime. Whether for good or ill, the family exists and it behooves the jails to recognize that fact.

RESOURCES

Women's Detention Center, 1010 North Capital St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001.

Female Offender Program, YWCA, 26 Howard Street, Springfield, Massachusetts 01105.

Bucks County Department of Corrections, 138 South Pine Street, Doylestown, Pennsylvania 18901.

Family and Children's Services, 414 South Eighth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404.

Mothers in Prison Project, American Friends Service Committee, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60605.

Prison Families Anonymous, 131 Jackson Street, Hempstead, New York 11550.

(Legal Cases on contact visiting) *Jones* v. *Wittenberg* 330 F. Supp 707 (N.D., Ohio 1971) aff'd sub. nom; *Jones* v. *Metzger* 456 F 2nd 854 (6th Cir. 1972). See also: *Brenneman* v. *Madigan* 343 F. Supp. 128 (N.D., Cal. 1972).

Offender Family Crisis Intervention Program, 2410 Tampa Street, Tampa, Florida 33601.

Education

Only 5% of the jails in this country (a total of 215 institutions) offer adult basic education courses.[1] Of that 5%, few offer equitable education programs to incarcerated women, despite the overall low educational level of women inmates. Although this level varies according to locality (sixth grade in Texas, eighth in rural Pennsylvania, tenth in Philadelphia), in the U.S. as a whole, 46% of women offenders left school before reaching the tenth grade.[2]

The importance of educational skills cannot be overstated: female high school dropouts are seriously disadvantaged in the labor market, with an annual unemployment rate as high as 37.5%.[3] Without the academic credentials, women offenders face the dismal choice between waitressing and prostitution, store clerking and shoplifting, as the only viable means to meet their economic needs. Seven out of ten women workers have at least a high school education; the remaining 30% suffer chronic under- and unemployment because of insufficient education.

The education system has failed the woman offender in the past, and one cannot short-circuit the lost years during the brief period of incarceration. The majority of pretrial and sentenced women will spend less than six months in jail, hardly a realistic time to complete any meaningful academic curriculum.

The goal, therefore, is to introduce women offenders to educational opportunities, offered in the context of postrelease continuity. A small amount of education that begins and ends in jail may impair postrelease prospects, by false promises and unrealistic expectations.

Educational program should be introduced to pretrial and sentenced women at three levels: (a) basic literacy; (b) preparation for the General Equivalency Diploma (GED); and (c) college-level courses.

Educational programs for women in jails have traditionally failed because of insufficient interest. The reason lies more in the averaging tendency of the course content than it does in women's rejection of education per se. Studies across the country repeatedly show education to be among women's greatest concerns; the need and interest are there, individually designed programs are not.

Twelve percent of women offenders are functionally illiterate (reading level below the fifth grade),[4] facing problems such as how do they read

---

[1] *The Nation's Jails: A Report on the Census of Jails from the 1972 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails*, pp. 12-13.

[2] Margery L. Velimesis, "The Female Offender," p. 1.

[3] *Facts on Women Workers of Minority Races*, U.S. Department of Labor, p. 8.

[4] Clearinghouse for Offender Literacy Programs, p. 7.

or write letters home, understand the printed rules of the institution, or order from the commissary. Upon release, the welfare forms, employment applications, apartment leases, or bus schedules cannot be read or understood.

The Literacy Volunteers of America (LVA) has developed a reading skills program that is being used in thirteen states across the country. LVA recruits volunteers from the community who are willing to make a year's commitment, with training provided through an 18-hour workshop. In addition to basic literacy education, the volunteers also offer English as a second language for those who can already read and write in another language.

The minimum one-year commitment screens out the voyeuristic "do-gooders" and encourages those who will act as advocates and friends, as well as teachers. Learning to read is a slow process, as is developing a trusting relationship.

LVA offers tutorial workshops, tests, textbooks, teachers' handbooks, slides, and technical assistance. This basic literacy program is complete and replicable in small and large jails. It is also effective. In a special New York State Corrections Project, the first 47 inmate students who had been taught an average of 38.5 hours showed improvement by 1.25 school grades in word recognition and reading comprehension, about double the rate expected of students in school.

The American Bar Association's Clearinghouse on Offender Literacy offers technical assistance regarding literacy education, via regional workshops, on-site visits, publications, and learning packets for individualized use among the inmate population. The packets focus on vocabulary development and comprehension skills necessary in applying for food stamps, establishing a checking account, and completing a loan or job application, including sample forms for the student to fill out.

The Clearinghouse can offer suggestions on the use of music, survival packages, comics, and games to inject imagination into the literacy education curriculum. Though their objective is to train correctional educators, their programming ideas can also be effectively implemented by volunteers or community agencies.

Citizen and Offender Programs in Education, Inc., in Milwaukee has found the use of audiovisual equipment to be an effective means of offering educational materials to a nonliterate group of women at the Milwaukee County Jail and House of Correction. Though the program purchased equipment through their LEAA grant, equipment might also be donated or loaned at minimum cost.

Nonreaders set their own learning goals, work in an open classroom setting, and tutors supplement the curriculum with an available supply of illustrated reading material such as fashion magazines, *True Story*, and adult books at the fourth to sixth grade reading levels. Your local city librarian can help you compile a list of appropriate books, written about adult subjects (particularly regarding parenting), in a simplified vocabulary.

Libraries can be developed through book donations (from individuals and publishers), raising money through clubs and church groups, or by asking the public library to set up a revolving collection in the women's unit. YWCA volunteers established a library for women at the Spokane County Jail in 1971, and two years later, the county library extended their outreach program to include the jail. A librarian is provided one full day per week.

The American Library Association offers technical assistance on how to establish or improve jail libraries, and publishes several booklets and a quarterly newsletter for correctional institutions.

The American Correctional Association's "Project READ" is another source of (paperback) books and appropriate book titles for the inmate reading at a juvenile level. The program can also offer assistance in diagnosis of specific reading problems, through in-service training for volunteers or staff. The program utilizes motivational techniques such as the use of music, comic strips, TV guides, menus, labels, driving manuals, cooking, sewing, and other functional instructions and signs.

Women with basic reading and math skills who lack their high school diploma should be offered a GED preparation program during incarceration. If offered by volunteers, or in association with a community agency, this program could continue after release until the woman passes the tests.

If your local jail already offers a GED program for male inmates, every effort should be made to offer a coeducational program. Despite the fears of most jail administrators, coed programs in numerous institutions have proved successful and cost-effective. Once the initial introduction is made, students will settle down to their class work. Secondary benefits will also occur: males will be more courteous and less vulgar, females more aware of their total self-context. For most women, learning to relate to men in nonsexual ways is a more important need than learning to attract men sexually.[1] The Memphis (Tenn.) Correctional Center, Framingham (Mass.) State Prison, Maine Correctional Center, and the U.S. Bureau of Prisons have all bravely offered coed programs, without incurring the increased cost of duplicate courses for women.

Jails that are not ready for coed programming, and lack funds for an educational counselor in the women's unit, should investigate the use of student teachers from a local college, VISTA volunteers, or CETA workers. Your local school department should also be considered as a possible resource. Women at the Santa Rita Rehabilitation Center (Alameda County) in Pleasanton, California, receive adult basic education through a subcontract with Amador High School. Similarly, college courses are offered at the jail through Chabot College.

Your local community's retired teachers' association might also be a potential source of manpower. Inmate teachers may also be effective tutors; however, their efforts must be reinforced and their own educational goals addressed.

---

[1] Annette Brodsky, "Planning for the Female Offender: Directions for the Future," *The Female Offender*, p. 103.

The most available source of potential tutors are the female correctional officers. Though most have only been given a security orientation to their jobs, sensitizing this group to their equally important treatment role will help them constructively motivate the educational pursuits of women in the unit. It will also help them work more closely with volunteers tutoring in the women's section.

The U.S. Bureau of Prisons, in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin, has developed a comprehensive programmed instruction program for correctional officers, with one section on "Jail and Community Corrections Programs." It is a self-taught program, available at minimum cost. Local correctional facilities are also encouraged to send new staff to the federal Atlanta Staff Training Center (as space permits), for their two-week "Introduction to Correctional Techniques," one-week "Advanced Correctional Techniques," and specialty training programs.

The importance of involvement and support by women officers cannot be overstated: training and independent study programs offered to them have significantly increased the rehabilitative function of the unit. Susan Ellen Katrin's study at the Georgia Rehabilitation Center for Women tested the effectiveness of a 40-hour, 13-week in-house staff training program. Katrin found increased social interest and decreased anxiety from the 105 randomly tested female inmates.

The Rehabilitation Research Foundation offers an Individually Prescribed Instructional (IPI) System for basic education, based on a self-teaching program. The IPI System helps the student diagnose what she already knows, eliminating the boredom and time of reviewing previously mastered materials. An instructor's guide is available, to help a tutor evaluate the learner's progress and reinforce success. Diverse groups of students have advanced one grade level in 63 hours of programmed instruction. Though self-teaching has inherent motivation problems, the coordination of the IPI System with volunteer tutors, or offering it in an open classroom environment, will overcome the problem. Reinforcement must be built into any self-teaching program.

Another independent-study program is available through TV High School, developed by the Manpower Education Institute. The course consists of 60 half-hour lessons, covering the five subject areas tested (English, math, science, social studies, literature). A home-study kit, with ten paperback texts and a study guide containing lesson outlines, study aids, and bibliographies, is available for a nominal cost.

Like basic literacy training, GED preparation is a long-term commitment, and not one that can be completed during incarceration alone. A post-release component is vitally important: the objective is not just to run programs in jail, but to help jailed women begin to develop educational tools.

GED examinations can be taken repeatedly, until all five sections receive a minimum score, as established by each state department of education. Spanish versions of the GED have been available since 1971 and are administered in 29 states. The high school equivalency diploma is issued by the state, not from any individual high school.

A woman may quickly pass four sections, but need extended time to achieve the minimum grade on the last. Women have the most difficulty on the math section, and innovative teaching ideas will be needed to make math interesting and relevant. The more math problems can be related to everyday needs (figuring the ingredients for half a recipe, computing a weekly budget, balancing a checkbook, computing the sales tax on a new dress), the more easily the women will relate to the seemingly abstract math problems on the test. In all subjects, there is a need for imaginative people who can transmit the subject matter without the sense of grinding drudgery that so often created a school dropout to begin with.[1]

The third level of programming to be offered relates to those interested in top quality education beyond high school. In 1974, the annual unemployment rate for women was 6.7%, compared with 4.8% for men,[2] indicating that women are going to need postsecondary education if they are going to successfully compete in the labor market.

Community colleges across the country are becoming increasingly involved in offender education programs, offered at the jails and on their own campuses.

Since 1973, El Centro Community College has offered courses for credit at the Dallas County Jail, covering a wide spectrum of subjects. Taught at the jail, the students work in six-week "fastraks" or terms, with courses specially designed around inmate interests, experiences, and needs.

Eighty percent of the students complete the course with an "A" or "B," attributed to competition between students increasing motivation and learning.

Two ex-offenders work as peer counselors within the three Dallas jails, handling prerelease planning. The overall recidivism rate of inmates in the college program (3-1/2 years and 1,4000 women inmates) is less than 2%, and more than three-quarters of the women in the Dallas County Jail are enrolled.

Miami-Dade Community College operates the CPORE (Comprehensive Program of Rehabilitative Education) for offenders in Dade County, Florida, including the Women's Detention Center. Faculty of the college go to the jails and teach regular college courses, in 16-week terms for sentenced inmates, and 8-week terms (meeting twice as often per week) for pretrial detainees. Courses include early childhood education, business practices, basic skills, and the learning lab, a self-directed program using tape cassettes, films, and various response forms. Being developed is a comprehensive career development model for women offenders, particularly as it relates to the needs of minority women.[3]

---

[1] Marie Buckley, *Breaking into Prison*, p. 32.

[2] *Highlights of Women's Employment and Education*, May 1975, U.S. Department of Labor, p. 2.

[3] Funded through the Women's Educational Equity Act, U.S. Office of Education.

Northeastern Illinois University's Center for Inner City Studies, and the State Board of Higher Education collectively sponsor the Women's Educational Resource Center, offering college courses for credit at the Cook County Women's Correctional Center. The WERC reinforces the educational classes with special workshops at the jail, including such topics as careers, reentry, and meeting the needs of the mature woman. Women are encouraged to enroll in programs during incarceration that could be continued at the Center upon release.

The Blackburn Correctional Complex in Kentucky offers college courses at the institution by allowing members of the outside public to attend. The 12-hour college program successfully integrates police, secretaries, nurses, and inmates, overcoming fears about security and coed programming. This model helps to normalize the in-house educational experience, through diverse student backgrounds.

Jails that have a small daily female population may still make college courses available through educational furloughs, as is done at the Auraria Campus of the Community College of Denver, and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville. Both schools integrate offenders into regular college courses, providing special counseling and liaison with the criminal justice system. Inmates are screened for motivation, but otherwise treated as regular students. The institutions have not suffered any special (sex-related) problems by enrolling women offenders in the colleges, and this community-based program facilitates a continuity of activities for the inmate upon release. A constructive social network can be established as well as academic skills developed.

College credit may also be obtained from a number of schools through independent study. "University Without Walls" and "Open University" approaches are available through such schools as Syracuse University, Goddage College, the University of Oklahoma, and the University of South Florida. Information on other flexible degree programs is available from the National University Extension Association.

Financial aid for tuition is available in the form of loans and grants through a number of sources:

1. Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (up to $1,400);

2. Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program (up to $1,500);

3. National Direct Student Loans (long-term, low interest (3%) loans);

4. Guaranteed Student Loan Program (low-cost, insured loans from private commercial lenders at a maximum 7% interest rate);

5. College Work Study Program (performing jobs at either the colleges or at public or nonprofit agencies with which the school has an agreement);

6. Cooperative Education (federal grants to colleges to establish programs of alternate full-time academic study and full-time employment);

7. Social Security (benefits available to unmarried full-time students under age 22, with one parent retired, disabled, or deceased);

8. Scholarships from private foundations, with a directory available from your state attorney general's office;

9. Small scholarships available through local chapters of Business and Professional Women's Club, Zonta Club, Association for Women's Active Return to Education (AWARE), American Association of University Women (AAUW), and women's church groups.

To enhance motivation in all educational programs, correctional institutions are implementing the American Correctional Association's "Mutual Agreement Programming." MAP is based on the concept of inmate participation and responsibility in program development and completion. Its formalized aspect is a legal contract among the inmate, institution, and parole board, and includes a definite parole date contingent upon the completion of mutually agreed-upon rehabilitation goals.

Inmates in Arizona who have completed contract programming credited MAP with getting them out earlier, improving their job chances, and reducing their risk of recidivism.[1] The MAP concept requires the institutions to provide programs, and requires the parole boards to grant parole on a given date (known ahead of time) if the inmate fulfills her goals.

Correctional institutions that fail to offer women inmates equitable educational opportunities may be subject to class action suits, as was done recently in Maryland, *Grosso* v. *Lally*. The March 1977 consent decree ordered that educational opportunities (among other issues) be no less favorable, either quantitatively or qualitatively, than those that are available to men. A similar complaint is still pending in Massachusetts: *Mindola* v. *Smith* charges that the Worcester County Jail discriminates against women inmates by offering educational programs and facilities to men, but denying these services to women.

We know that by introducing education programs in jails, we can help a certain percentage of offenders stay away from crime in the future. The results should be considered from a qualitative, not quantitative, perspective. They must also be tied in with community continuity for postrelease programming.

Without opportunities for academic studies, the women are going to get another kind of education. Said one woman, "I went in just knowing my own thing. You know. What I did to be sent to jail. I came out with a good education in a lot of other kinds of crime."

---

[1] *Mutual Agreement Programming: An Overview*, American Correctional Association, p. 21.

RESOURCES

Literacy Education

Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc., 3002 James Street, Syracuse, New York 13206.

Clearinghouse for Offender Literacy Programs, American Bar Association, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Citizen and Offender Programs in Education, Inc., 1015 North 9th Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233.

Libraries

Project READ, American Correctional Association, 4321 Hartwick Road, Suite 306, College Park, Maryland 20740.

YWCA, West 829 Broadway Avenue, Spokane, Washington 99201.

American Library Association, Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

Basic Education

Santa Rita Rehabilitation Center, Alameda County, P. O. Box 87, Pleasanton, California 94566.

Individually Prescribed Instructional (IPI) System, Rehabilitation Research Foundation, P. O. Box 3587, Montgomery, Alabama 36109.

GED Information: available from your local Superintendent of Schools, or Adult Education Supervisor, or write to the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1225 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Also, contact the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experience, American Council on Education, 1 Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

TV High School, Manpower Education Institute, 450 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017; or Great Plains Instructional Television Library, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508; or Dr. Catherine G. Nichols, College of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85281.

College Programs

El Centro Community College/Dallas County Jail Educational Program, Department of Planning, Research and Grants, Records Building, Dallas, Texas 75202.

Miami-Dade Community College/Comprehensive Program of Rehabilitative Education, Division of Community Services, North Campus, Room 1110, Scott Hall, 11380 N.W. 27th Avenue, Miami, Florida 33167.

Women's Educational Resource Center, Center for Inner City Studies, 4545 South Drexel Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60653.

Blackburn Correctional Complex, Route 8, Lexington, Kentucky 40504.

Community College of Denver, Auraria Campus, 1111 West Colfax Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80204.

Offender ANSWER Program, Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, 940 Main Street, Jacksonville, Florida 32202.

Directories of accredited home-study colleges are available from: National University Extension Association, Suite 360, 1 Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (*Guide to Independent Study* and *A Directory of U.S. College and University Degrees for Part-time Students)*; also, National Home Study Council, 1601 18th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

Legal Cases

Grosso v. *Lally*, c/o The National Prison Project of the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1031, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Mindola v. *Smith*, c/o Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union Foundation, Women's Rights Project, 68 Devonshire Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02109.

Correctional Officer Training

Jail and Community Corrections Programs, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Public Documents Division, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Atlanta Staff Training Center, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, 523 McDonough Boulevard, S.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30315.

Facilitation Training, Susan Ellen Katrin, Department of Counseling and Psychological Services, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia.

Miscellaneous

Mutual Agreement Programming, American Correctional Association, Parole-Corrections Project, 4321 Hartwick Road, Room 212, College Park, Maryland 20740.

A Guide to Seeking Funds from CETA, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C. 20210.

Specific Information on Tuition Grants and Loan Sources:
1975 Handbook on Women Workers, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C. 20210.

Scholarships

Altrusa International Foundation, Founders Fund Vocational Aid Awards Committee, 332 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

American Association of University Women (AAUW), c/o Mary Hoch, Director of Fellowships Program, 2401 Virginia Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

Association for Women's Active Return to Education (AWARE), c/o Mitzi Fielding, 5820 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 605, Los Angeles, California 90036.

Business and Professional Women's Foundation 2012 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Council on Southern Universities, c/o Executive Director, Diuguid Fellowships, 795 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30308.

Hannah Harrison School of the YWCA, 4470 MacArthur Boulevard, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007.

Phi Lambda Pi, c/o Kathleen G. Clements, National President, 1241 Meadow Lea Drive, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808.

Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387.

University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, c/o Admissions Officer, Mid-Career Fellowships, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.

Vocational Programs

In 1974 nearly 36 million women were in the full-time labor force,[1] with two-thirds of them working for the same reason as men work: *for economic need.* A March 1975 report by the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor stated that 23% of women workers are single, 19% are widowed, divorced, or separated, and 26% are married, with husbands' earnings under $10,000.

Such statistics effectively shatter the myth that most women have babies and stay home. In fact, the Labor Department reported that in 1976 only 7% of the American families function in that once-normative mode. Women work because they have to support themselves and their families, and the vocational needs of women offenders must be addressed from this perspective. Too many institutional training programs presume that a woman's income is a second income, and that it alone will not need to be sufficient to support a family. Eighty percent of women in jails are single mothers, and expect to have to support themselves and their children upon release.

Sex-tracked training programs continue to pump women into low-paying jobs. Despite the fact that increasing numbers of women are securing higher level and better paying positions, the earnings gap between men and women continues to widen. In 1955 women's full-time earnings were 63% of men's; in 1970 they were 59%, and in 1975 the $11,835 earned by men was 75% more than the $6,772[2] earned by women. Women's liberation has helped the middle-class woman to equity in employment, but poor women continue to struggle with entry-level, low-paying jobs. Eighty-two percent of women (but only 38% of men) earn less than $10,000 per year, and 63% earn less than $5,000.

While vocational programs for women in jail train women as domestics, or other "women's occupations" such as typing or sewing, men's programs are more likely in higher paying occupations, such as auto repair, electronics, radio and television repair, printing, and carpentry.[3]

Vocational counseling programs that aim for meaningful job placements should be mindful of the growing demands for certain kinds of skilled workers: electronic computer operating personnel, library technicians, technical health occupations such as EEG technician, inhilation therapist, occupational or physical therapy assistants, dental assistants and hygienists, and medical laboratory workers, as well as service workers such as cosmetologists and Licensed Practical Nurses.[4] Most of these jobs require post-

---

[1] *Highlights of Women's Employment and Education,* May 1975, U.S. Department of Labor, p. 1.

[2] *The Earnings Gap Between Women and Men,* U.S. Department of Labor, p. 1.

[3] Marilyn G. Haft, "Women in Prison," *Prisoners Rights Sourcebook,* pp. 345-346.

[4] *Careers for Women in the 70s,* U.S. Department of Labor, pp. 1-10.

secondary school training, but less than four years of college. Wages are high enough to reasonably support a woman and her family.

Between 1960 and 1970, a dramatic shift occurred to almost double the number of women in the skilled trades. The Supported Work Program of Wider Opportunities for Women in Washington, D.C., was initiated in 1974 as a pilot project to work with women offenders in nontraditional occupations. Women have been placed as welders and carpenters, service representatives for copying machines, and as meat cutter apprentices and meat wrappers. In each of these fields, the counselors work with employers to design and manage programs that will ensure the success of the women they hire.

Despite the innovative approach of WOW, training women offenders in unorthodox occupations must be approached somewhat carefully. Women inmates see themselves in traditional terms, and are not responsive to women's lib issues. They leave the institutions with enough strikes against them as it is, without demanding that they be models for other women. Training for such occupations may be available to individual women on a work release basis, however, and support of the trade unions enlisted for apprenticeship programs.

More traditional was "Operation IBM" at Westfield Farm for Women in New York.[1] In 1964 IBM placed keypunch machines and verifiers at the institution, to offer training in keypunch operations. With a month's training, women began work on their first contract work, done for the Department of Public Works. Women enrolled in the program worked seven or more hours per day, an unusual accomplishment, since few programs manage anywhere near an eight-hour day for inmates in any assignment. After being trained for IBM, women were encouraged to take a Civil Service examination, enhancing their future job opportunities.

State Fair Community College in Sedalia, Missouri, ran a Nurse's Aide Training Program for unskilled women at the Correctional Center for women at Tipton, Missouri, from 1971-1975. Based on 120 class hours and 15 clinical hours of experience, the program intensively trained 50 inmates as nurse's aides during the four years. Special attention was placed on teaching behavioral attitudes and skills for work in nursing homes and long-term patient care units. Nearly 60% of the nurse's aide trainees found and retained jobs in the field after release.

Women offenders interested in Social Service work might be given an opportunity to obtain community volunteer work through work furloughs. The Utah State Prison for Women, in cooperation with local agencies such as Headstart, YWCA, NAACP, mental health clinics and programs for juveniles, places women inmates in actual employment settings, on a volunteer basis. The program aims to give women inmates experience in social agencies, as an entree to jobs in the field. Strict expectations for job performance are drawn ahead of time, giving the inmate an opportunity to assess the realities, responsibilities, and rewards of working. It also provides the mechanism for

---

[1] The Westfield Farm facility closed several years ago. Women are now incarcerated at the Bedford Hills Correctional Facility.

women to give of themselves to others, rather than always being the recipient of services. Women also have a chance to learn the relational skills of the middle-class work environment.

The singularly more outstanding program for women inmates was the Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders. PPWGO documented court, prison, and probation programs for a decade; they consulted with officials in other states, and published numerous articles, working papers, and criminal justice goals. Unfortunately, PPWGO lost all funding on October 31, 1977, and the organization completely dissolved. Their files are now in the archives at Temple University in Philadelphia.

Though their primary emphasis was on alternatives to incarceration, the program also served inmates at the Philadelphia House of Correction. Staff worked intensively in the community to develop training and job resources for women offenders, using already existing resources. Their focus on the development of community training and job resources involved educational workshops for community members, films, discussions, informational literature, and extensive public relations. A model for other states, PPWGO coordinated criminal justice planning and programming for women in county jails and the state prison at Muncie.

The Female Offenders Program of Western Pennsylvania offers prerelease and job development services to women at the Allegheny County Jail. Speakers are invited to the unit regularly to talk about employment opportunities and training programs, as a means of educating the community as well as the women residents.

The Womanpower Project in Sacramento, California, is working to promote self-sufficiency through employment and training. Focusing primarily on ex-offenders, the program also has an outreach program at the Sacramento County Women's Detention Facility in Elk Grove. Counseling, testing, preemployment workshops, referrals, job readiness counseling, and job placement are offered to both incarcerated and released women offenders.

The Women's Justice Program of the Rochester, New York, YWCA offers weekly career skills classes for Monroe County women offenders, helping women select career fields, role play job interviews, and develop social skills. Values of the new "work ethic" are explored, helping women assess the coping skills of crime and unemployment in the contexts of regular, full-time employment. Realistic expectations of the rewards of work are also explored. The WJP staff and clients develop a contract for women to set their own goals, remedial action indicated, and the kind of help they have a right to expect from the program. Working closely with the YWCA is the Women's Jail Project, also helping women find non-sex-tracked training and jobs. Like the Pennsylvania programs, public education about women's problems is an active objective of both Rochester organizations.

The Female Offender Rehabilitation Program in Nassau County N.Y. was developed and administered by the county's Women's Services rather than the Sheriff's department to enable more flexibility and innovation. Career counseling includes decision making, communication skills, interpersonal relationships, adjustments of family to the new working lifestyle, and techniques of the job search.

While applying directly to employers is the most effective way of finding a job (48.5%), women are more likely to take the more indirect approach and ask friends (16% effective).[1] Without the "straight world's" social network, women offenders entering the job market for the first time cannot rely on unemployed or underemployed friends to find them jobs. The program has also developed a lending library of women's vocationally-related books, pamphlets, and magazines, and conducts an active community job development effort.

Where in-house or community-based training programs may not be feasible, offenders may consider enrolling in correspondence courses for credit; a cross-index of correspondence courses is offered by the member institutions of the National University Extension Association. To supplement a woman's self-teaching studies, a person from the community engaged in the specific vocational field might be enlisted to meet regularly with the woman -- answering questions, providing support, and reality testing the vocational choice. The volunteer might also become a vocational advocate when the course is completed and the woman released.

Until recently, clearinghouse information on innovative vocational programs was difficult to obtain. However, four sources are available for technical assistance: the American Bar Association's Female Offender Resource Center in Washington, the American Correctional Association's CONtact Center in Nebraska, the National Alliance of Businessmen, and the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor.

Both the Female Offender Resource Center and the CONtact Center are beginning to compile information on correctional programs, which is disseminated in newsletters, special publications (such as CONtact's *Ex-Offender Employment)*, and personalized referrals back to organizations and individuals in your local area.

Another valuable resource is the National Alliance of Businessmen, with local chapters across the country. Since 1973, NAB's Ex-Offender Programs have been promoting equal opportunity for ex-offenders, and educating the business community through seminars, jail tours, and regional conferences. Their Career Motivation Institutes bring businessmen and women into the jails to talk with inmates and administrators about the current job opportunities, labor market conditions, employer and employee expectations. Over 11,000 ex-offenders were placed in significant jobs in FY 1976 through NAB's efforts.

Similarly, the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor has shown special interest in vocational programs for women offenders, and regional offices can offer assistance with Apprenticeship Outreach Programs, the Work Incentive Program, CETA, and other Labor Department programs.

Almost all the women behind bars will one day be released back into their home communities. Vocational counseling and training offered at the jail may make the difference between those women contributing productively versus continuing a life of crime.

---

[1] *1975 Handbook on Women Workers,* U.S. Department of Labor, p. 73.

RESOURCES

Supported Work Program, Wider Opportunities for Women, 1649 K Street, 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20006.

IBM Keypunch Project, Bedford Hills Correctional Facility, Bedford Hills, New York 10507.

Nurse's Aide Training, State Fair Community College, 1900 Clarendon Road, Sedalia, Missouri 65301.

Inmate Volunteer Program, Division of Corrections, Utah State Prison, P.O. Box 250, Draper, Utah 85020.

Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders, 1530 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 10102.

Female Offenders Program of Western Pennsylvania, Inc. 906 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219.

Women's Justice Program of the YWCA, 175 North Clinton Avenue, Rochester, New York 14604.

Women's Jail Project, 101 Plymouth Avenue South, Rochester, New York 14608.

Female Offender Rehabilitation Program, Nassau County Women's Services, One Old Country Road, Carle Place, New York 11514.

Correspondence courses: University Extension Division, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

CONtact Center, American Correctional Association, P.O. Box 81826, Lincoln, Nebraska 68501.

Female Offender Resource Center, American Bar Association, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

National Alliance of Businessmen, 1730 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Washington, D.C. 20210.

Project HIRE (Helping Industry Recruit Ex-offenders) has developed a 12-minute film to help job applicants understand the challenges and demands of work. The instructional kit is available at low cost from HIRE, Division of Support Services, 1009 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403.

Womanpower Project, Women's Justice Forum, Inc., 818 19th Street (upstairs), Sacramento, California 95814.

Recreation

No one knows exactly what, who, when, or how human behavior can be influenced or changed. The women inmates who cannot relate to a middle-class tutor may relate very well to a grandmotherly sewing instructor who represents the loving mother she never had.

One woman's life may be changed by books, another's by a drama club's visiting the jail and putting on a benefit performance. A discussion group may touch one woman, a macramé class another.

Each person's background, abilities, experiences, likes, and dislikes are different, and no one kind of program, activity, or person will have an effect on all the women.[1] Recreational programming in jails should be diverse and utilize male and female volunteers; there should also be enough choices so women aren't forced to do something they aren't really interested in, just to combat boredom.

The woman's club of your local Lutheran Church is a prime resource for offering volunteer programming. Their 1977 national goal was to "Reach Out to Women in Prison," including county and city jails. Their focus is on long-term, one-to-one support, including individualized recreation programs. Similarly, International Liaison, Inc., recruits Catholic volunteers from across the country, acting as a switchboard to match volunteer skills and institutional needs.

Recreational programming should be developed along three lines: intellectual, self-enrichment, and physical exercise. In each area, women need the opportunity to accomplish something and to develop positive use of leisure time. Recreation is not a luxury, but an integral part of rehabilitation programming. We must treat women as total people, not just focus on their educational or job deficiencies. Efforts in the recreational programs will have positive impact on work in other areas.

Intellectual programming includes activities such as legal education, assertiveness training, values clarification, films and group discussions, poetry, lectures, and concerts. Don't let the limitations of the institution still your imagination, and don't underestimate the interest levels of the incarcerated women.

Volunteers from the Bates College of Law at the University of Houston conduct regularly scheduled discussion sessions in civil law for women at the Harris County (Texas) Jail. Topics include: employment discrimination, landlord and tenants' rights, consumer fraud, welfare rights, child custody, divorce, and minority rights. Law students also work on legal problems of individual women, receiving course credit and valuable experience. Similarly, New York University's Law School provides law students and volunteer attorneys to provide both legal counseling and legal

---

[1] Marie Buckley, *Breaking into Prison*, p. 26,

education for the inmates. Law librarians should be recruited to establish or enhance jail law libraries for civil and criminal research by women inmates; technical assistance is available from the American Association of Law Libraries in Chicago.

Junior Leaguers in Oklahoma City sponsor field trips from the Women's Treatment Facility, including cultural and civic events, as well as speaking engagements with area clubs and employers. Women offenders, with volunteer League members, add impact to community development efforts, enhance their own public speaking skills, and enjoy a day or evening away from the jail.

Junior League involvement in criminal justice is nationwide, an outgrowth of its 1973 "Impact" Project, focusing on various aspects of the system. It is an excellent source of dedicated volunteers.

The local YWCA organizations are also becoming increasingly involved in programs for women offenders. YWCA Intervention Programs in New York's Buffalo and Erie Counties, as well as Syracuse, Peekskill, White Plains, Center Westchester, and Yonkers, offer programs regarding women's issues, consumer education, politics, child development, health, and civic concerns.

Similarly, YWCAs in Corpus Christi and San Antonio, Texas, as well as Cincinnati, Ohio, have developed recreational programs with an intellectual and rehabilitative function. In Spokane, Washington, the YWCA has sponsored a weekly "potpourri" program for women at the Spokane County Jail since 1972, with volunteer speakers on such topics as child abuse and rape; YWCA volunteers also lead weekly discussions on various health topics.

Self-enrichment recreation includes activities such as sewing, arts and crafts, music, photography, pottery, cooking, puppet shows at the local children's hospital, fashion shows at a woman's club.

Recruit artists from your community to sponsor art classes (in groups or individually) with resources for displaying and selling their art. The Stone Foundation in Chicago opened and ran a store outside the institutions, giving the public a chance to see and buy the artwork. Or, enlist local galleries to take the work on speculation. In-house gift shops rarely work; few members of the public ever get to see it. In New York, the Floating Foundation of Photography conducted a photographic workshop for offenders, and took on the responsibility of displaying the results for the general public.

Sewing classes are always popular, and machines could be donated or loaned from the local trade schools or recreational agencies. The Springfield, Mass., YWCA needed fabric for women at the Hampden County Jail and ran an article in the local newspaper asking for donations. Over 50 bags of fine wool, silk, cotton, denim, etc., were collected.

The Red Cross in Tucson, Arizona, sponsors an ongoing first aid course for women inmates at the Pima County Jail, teaching emergency skills relevant to themselves and their families. Your local Red Cross chapter might also consider sponsoring a CPR (Cardio-Pulminary Resuscitation) course, training women offenders in proper emergency techniques for heart attack victims.

Junior Leaguers at the Women's House of Detention on Rikers Island (N.Y.) teach how to plan, purchase, prepare, and serve basic meals, using the jail kitchen for the classroom.

Volunteers at Harris County (Texas) lead weekly group singing sessions, with the choral music receiving enthusiastic response. Such a group could be developed into a women's (or mixed) choir for Sunday church services, to root the singing in a concrete reality. Invite choirs from local schools or churches to enhance your singing program.

The YWCA in Reading, Penn., has sponsored a Spanish Christmas Party to celebrate the traditional Feast of the Three Kings at the Berks County Jail each year since 1975. Held in January, the celebration includes a special program of Spanish food and musical entertainment. Traditional Christmas parties and Martin Luther King Day are also celebrated with special activities. Volunteers in the community cook and plan and coordinate the events with inmate involvement.

Holidays are lonely times in jail, and special programs (particularly those that involve the women's children) help boost low morale. Handcrafted games, toys, and clothing that the women can give their children for gifts (a specially carved pumpkin for Halloween, an Easter basket, Valentines, and artful Christmas presents) address the need for giving as well as receiving. Retail stores in the community are supportive of donating gifts, also.

Physical recreation programs need not just focus on the few "jocks" who are gifted athletes. Most of us haven't played group sports since high school and don't intend to. Teach the women a physical exercise they can use on the outside -- swimming, tennis, yoga, modern dance, calisthenics, isometrics.

The YWCA in Portland, Maine, opens their gym and pool to women at the Maine Correctional Center, free of charge. Many women in jail don't know how to swim and the local Red Cross could suggest volunteer lifesavers and swim instructors. Where few jails have gymnasiums or swimming pools anyway, the few that do severely limit women's use of the facilities; equipment is generally male-oriented, with bar bells, boxing gloves, and ropes to climb. Local public schools may open their gym facilities to women, as might the city's recreation department.

If women indicate an interest in volleyball, basketball, or baseball, recruit a local gym teacher to organize a team, to play against other women's groups. Help the really interested women join one of those teams when they're released.

The Berks County Prison Society in Reading, Penn., sponsors weekly volleyball games for incarcerated women, combining the physical activities into an integrated volunteer program of rap sessions, crafts, and educational tutoring.

As is true of all in-house programming, the focus must be on activities that can be sustained by the women after release. Recreation programming

can give women outlets for creative expression, develop a sense of accomplishment, and enhance the productive use of leisure time.

As a final suggestion, learning to give can be a valuable recreational activity, and women at the Hampden County (Mass.) Jail have worked on crafts that they sell, then donate the profits to Muscular Dystrophy. Next year, a puppet show is planned for the local children's hospital.

If you're looking for a wide range of similar projects, the Star of the North Jaycees in Stillwater, Minnesota, can give you a number of creative money-making ideas that have rallied inmate support for Jerry Lewis's MD Campaign. From their "Sell-A-Cell" to the Disc Jockey Lock-Up, inmates actively work to raise money for charity. It's another aspect of the overall socialization process.

RESOURCES

"Reach Out to Women in Prison Program," The American Lutheran Church, 422 South Fifth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415.

Catholic volunteers: International Liaison, Inc., 39 Lackawanna Place, Bloomfield, New Jersey 07003.

Bates College Law Program: Women for Justice, 625 West Alabama, #4, Houston, Texas 77006.

New York University Law School, 13 University Place, New York, New York 10003

Committee on Law Library Service to Prisoners, American Association of Law Libraries, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

"Project IMPACT," The Association of Junior Leagues, Inc., 825 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

YWCA Intervention Programs, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10003.

American Red Cross, 222 South Cherry Avenue, Tuscon, Arizona 85719.

The American Red Cross in Greater New York, 150 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, New York 10023.

YWCA, Eighth and Washington Streets, Reading, Pennsylvania 19601.

YWCA, 87 Spring Street, Portland, Maine 04111.

YWCA, 9th & Walnut Streets, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

YWCA, 401 N. Carancahua, Corpus Christi, Texas 78401.

YWCA, 318 McCullough Street, San Antonio, Texas 78215.

YWCA, 26 Howard Street, Springfield, Massachusetts 01105.

YWCA, West 829 Broadway Avenue, Spokane, Washington 99201.

Star of the North Jaycees, Box 55, Stillwater, Minnesota 55082.

Berks County Prison Society, 532 Washington Street, Reading, Pennsylvania 19601.

Work/Education Release

Any discussion of educational/vocational programs in jail must address the issue of work release. Wisconsin's Huber Law of 1913 heralded the first work release programs in this country (modeled after a successful innovation in Ireland in 1870), authorizing sentenced misdemeanants to retain a job while serving their time. No state followed Wisconsin's lead for 40 years,[1] and it was not until the 1960s that participation was (theoretically) available to women.

A recent nationwide tour of county jails for a study funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration revealed few women participating in work release programs.[2] In the District of Columbia, 9% of the women, compared to 30% of the men, participate in work release.[3]

Jail administrators advance three arguments to justify the exclusion of women from work release: expense, the unsuitability of women for work release, and lack of separate housing facilities.

The first argument can be countered with an understanding of how the work release system operates. The money an inmate earns is transmitted directly from the employer to the program administrator. From these earnings, deductions can be made to defray administrative costs, room, and board. Money can also be deducted to support families, pay debts, and build savings accounts. Many correctional administrators have found that work release is usually self-supporting, and sometimes even profit-making because of the contributions made by the inmates.

The second argument against work release -- the unsuitability of women -- is based on: (a) the institution's failure to prepare women for meaningful jobs or job training programs; (b) belief in the myth that women do not have to support themselves or their children; (c) fears of sexual contacts by women during work release hours.

Nine out of ten women expect to have to support themselves and their dependents after release. However, giving work release opportunities to women in the context of dead-end jobs, like waitressing, dooms the experience to failure. Meaningful job training opportunities must be developed as part of the work release program. Alabama found that women were not as successful as men in work release because of their low skill level. Where men showed significantly higher earnings and lower postprison law encounters over nonparticipants, results for women did not show the same postprison benefits. Jails that cite the past failures of work release programs for women should look at opening the program to apprenticeship programs, advanced schooling, and other skills-building opportunities.

---

[1] Thirty-five states implemented work release by the early 1970s.

[2] Katharine Krause, "Denial of Work Release to Women," *Southern California Law Review*, p. 1458.

[3] Nancy Crisman, "The Female Offender," p. 3.

The third argument, lack of special housing, can be addressed in several ways: (a) rented and converted buildings such as YWCAs, motels, hotels; (b) special security precautions for work release women who are housed in a mixed unit (pretrial and sentenced); (c) coeducational housing, combining with the men's program; (d) legal cases such as: *Frontiero* v. *Richardson, Dawson* v. *Carberry, People* v. *Lemon, Barefield* v. *Leach,* requiring equal treatment, regardless of costs of providing separate facilities.

Fairfield Correctional Institution in Jacksonville, Florida, opened as a male work release center in 1972, and became coeducational in 1974. An outgrowth of the Duval County Jail, Fairfield House ranks among the "top ten" work release centers in the country, according to Walter Buscher, one of the country's foremost authorities on work release programs. Coeducational activities include recreational programs, in-house educational classroom work, group treatment sessions, meals, and casual conversation. The coed living environment for work release coincides with the coed working environment during the day. Women in the program are also entitled to participation based on study release and vocational training programs.

Participants are encouraged to set their own goals, and a 31-point "Goal Preference List" is used as an aid. From getting a driver's license to losing weight, finishing high school or stopping smoking, women's total reintegrative needs are addressed at Fairfield House.

Other successful work release programs for women have been developed at the Spokane (Wash.) County Jail, Bucks County (Penn.) Jail, Women's Detention Center (Miami), Nassau County (N.Y.) Correctional Center, Palm Beach (Fla.) County Jail, Rochester (N.Y.) Correctional Center, Palm Beach (Fla.) County Jail, Rochester (N.Y.) County Jail, San Francisco City Prison, Grafton (N.H.) and Women's Correctional Center in Chicago.

Work release programs ease the abrupt transition from jail to freedom, help participants demonstrate appropriate rehabilitative attitudes for child custody disputes, and enable women to leave the jail with a little money saved. It also has a less explicit benefit: inmates are afforded an opportunity to lead a normal sex life, overcoming the problems associated with sexual repression and inversion in jail.[1]

To minimize disruptions for accused inmates, work release should also be extended to pretrial detainees, so that their employment (if any) is not too seriously interrupted or lost together. They are, after all, presumed innocent, and the punishment of losing one's job is not warranted. Home work release for sentenced and pretrial women is also recommended by Richard D. Palmer, Associate Professor of Law, Capital University Law School, based on the presumption that stabilizing the family is consistent with rehabilitative goals.

---

[1]Hans Mattick, "The Contemporary Jails," p. 838.

RESOURCES

Legal Cases: *Frontiero* v. *Richardson* (U.S. Sup. Ct. 41 L.V. 4609, May 14, 1973); *Dawson* v. *Carberry* (San Francisco, No. C-71-1916-OJC, March 17, 1972); *People* v. *Lemon* (Los Angeles Sup. Ct., No. A-21-8275, May 6, 1968); *Barefield* v. *Leach* (U.S. Dist. Ct., New Mexico, Civ. #102-82, December 18, 1974).

Fairfield Correctional Institution, 515 Victoria Street, Jacksonville, Florida 32202.

Spokane County Work Release Program, 1100 West Mallon St., Spokane, Washington 99201.

Buck County Department of Corrections, 138 South Pine Street, Doylestown, Pennsylvania 18901.

Women's Detention Center, 1145 N.W. 11th Street, Miami, Florida 33125.

Nassau County Correctional Center, P.O. Box 172, East Meadow, New York 11554.

Palm Beach County Jail, 425 First St., West Palm Beach, Florida 33402.

Women's Jail Project, Rochester County Jail, 101 South Plymouth Avenue, Rochester, New York 14607.

Women's Resource Program, Office of the Sheriff, Room 333, City Hall, San Francisco, California 94102.

Grafton County Jail and House of Correction, P.O. Box 267, Woodsville, New Hampshire 03785.

Women's Correctional Center, Cook County Department of Corrections, 2900 South California, Chicago, Illinois 60608.

Alternatives to Incarceration

A 1970 national research study on halfway houses concluded that community residences have no negative effect on neighborhood property values or positive correlation with increased crime.[1] Enlightened communities across the country are recognizing the dehumanizing effect of jails on women offenders, and are developing community-based programs that serve as alternatives to incarceration for pretrial and sentenced women. Your goal should be broader than developing equitable programs for women and men in jail; it should incorporate plans for alternatives to the traditional institutions.

Perhaps the oldest such facility in the country is New York's Women's Prison Association and Hopper Home. Over 100 years old, the home incorporates their Court Diversion Project with services such as residence, work placement, and job development, Project Open Door's job training, and the Children of Offenders Project. Seventy percent of their clients have no new contact with the law. It is an independent, private, nonprofit organization.

Newgate for Women in St. Paul, Minnesota, collaborates with the University of Minnesota, and is a nonprofit educational corporation. Designed as an alternative for felons and gross misdemeanants who have the desire for further education or employment, the home provides group counseling, tuition, and fees at the U. of M., health coverage at reasonable costs, books, weekly stipend, clothing allowance, room and board -- including housing for children up to age nine. A child care specialist operates an ongoing program for the children.

Another alternative in St. Paul is Pi House, Inc., which opened in 1973, despite initial opposition from area residents. A year later, acceptance of the center was high, based on the frequency of friendly visits, volunteer work, and monetary donations from neighbors. With a maximum capacity of 14 women, the house is based on the belief that women should be given maximum rehabilitation opportunities for responsibilities and freedom. Educational and vocational services are not provided at the house, but referrals are made to area colleges, and training and manpower programs. Women are encouraged to pursue these programs, as well as volunteer for community service.

The Women's Community Center at the Seattle YWCA serves women felons from King, Pierce, and Snohomish (Washington) Counties, housing up to 18 women and eight children. The program began operating in April 1975, and is based on a contract between the WCC staff and each individual, using a system of graduated responsibility. Their aim is to develop personal, educational, and vocational skills, without creating dependency on WCC. Women are charged $5 per day to help defray room and board costs.

Money is very often a problem with rehabilitation programs, and the Omaha, Nebraska, YWCA has successfully converted an LEAA three-year grant into total funding through Douglas County. The Miriam Center (named after Miriam Van

---

[1] Kenneth B. Hardy and Judith A. Hecht, *Effects of Halfway Houses on Neighborhood Crime Rates and Property Values: Preliminary Survey*, District of Columbia Department of Corrections, Research Report No. 37, November 1970.

Waters, a leader in the progressive treatment of women offenders), offers residential facilities, outclient services, career and educational development, counseling, and job development.

Another facility that has stabilized fund raising is Horizon House in Milwaukee. Opened four years ago, the house serves women on parole, probation, those living there as an alternative to the local jail, as well as women who have had no contact with legal authorities at all, but have an intolerable living situation at home. Because of the distinct categories of women who have, and have not, had contact with the criminal justice system, funding is granted for the two distinct groups, though services do not differ for either group of transitional women.

Though many alternative facilities will not accept women with prior drug or alcohol problems, Women Inc. in Roxbury, Mass., is designed to provide an alternative therapeutic program for women whose crimes have been drug or alcohol related. The house can accommodate up to twelve women and eight children, and participants are required to make a minimum six-month commitment. Collaborated services are provided with the Women's Community Health Center in Cambridge and the Roxbury YWCA. Special children's programs are provided, as are weekly group sessions dealing with child-raising problems.

Development of an alternative housing program entails years of legal and political maneuvering; however, persistence will bring about institutional change. In Palm Beach County, Florida, a group of women from the local NOW chapter and Church Women United toured the Palm Beach County Jail in 1975, led by Assistant Public Defender Lois Frankel. Despite many months of frustrating negotiations, they successfully opened Sojourner Residence for women two years later. Public response to the facility resulted in thousands of dollars' worth of donated furniture, household items, clothing, and money. Sojourner Residence combines intensive counseling with educational and vocational opportunities, which were previously denied women at the local jail.

The Des Moines Project's Women's Residential Facility opened in September 1972, functioning as both a halfway house and an alternative to sentencing at the Polk County (Iowa) Jail. The focuses of the program are education, employment, training, and counseling, and all of the 15 women enrolled hold full-time jobs and pursue further educational skills. The environment of the house aims to minimize vestiges of institutionalization, and recidivism is extremely low.

The Des Moines Project also offers women alternatives to incarceration through their Pretrial Release Project and Pretrial Services Project. The Release Project establishes guidelines to assist the court in determining which accused persons are good risks to appear at court. The Pretrial Services Project adds a stipulation that clients receive supervision and counseling, with referrals made to other agencies. While an average of 50% are unemployed at the time of arrest, only 20% are unemployed after their participation in the project.

Similarly, the Pretrial Release Program at Orange County (Florida) has established guidelines to determine a woman's suitability for release. The program is administratively a part of the jail, and following certain release criteria, any staff person can authorize a woman's release. The woman is then free to maintain employment obligations, family responsibilities, and pursue any habilitation goals that are indicated.

The Middlesex County (Mass.) Women's Jail Project provides services to accused women in Suffolk, Middlesex, and Essex Counties, developing alternative resources in the community to meet women's needs. Though the project aims to gain release for most women, and provide educational and job development services outside the institution, it also works with pretrial women who have been incarcerated.

Central Piedmont Community College in Charlotte, N.C., sponsors an alternative for sentenced women through their vocational educational program that diverts offenders to the college. The program covers women's tuition, books, fees, transportation, and subsistence while attending classes. Courses range from College Adult Basic Education (CABE) and GED to existing curricula at the college level. CPCC's Offender Aid Program also offers Mecklenberg County offenders personal counseling, court advocacy, and job development.

In New Jersey, a new Pretrial Intervention system has been developed in 18 counties, administered by the Administrative Office of the Courts for uniform statewide standards. Though each county operates somewhat independently, the overall P.T.I. program aims to offer intensive counseling, educational, and vocational referrals, and court advocacy for eligible accused persons. The program recognizes the rights of the accused regarding rehabilitation, and is set up to minimize restrictive program requirements. P.T.I. is multiproblem oriented, recognizing that accused women (and men) are likely to be poor, unskilled, unemployed, and have assorted health and family problems, regardless of their innocence or guilt.

Because women's jails are so racially and sexually discriminatory, many community groups are organizing efforts to close the jails and develop a range of alternatives to incarceration. Women in Berkeley, California, have been working to close the Santa Rita County Jail, after fighting battles for humane treatment of women, particularly those who are pregnant. The Women's Jail Study Group in San Francisco similarly aims to close the women's jail at San Bruno.

The National Moratorium on Prison Construction argues that prisons and jails don't work, and alternatives should be developed that better reintegrate offenders. Community-based facilities are cheaper, more humane, and more effective.

Technical assistance on diversion projects is available from the new Pretrial Services Resource Center in Washington, D.C. The Center also serves as a clearinghouse for information on alternatives to incarceration, publishing a newsletter and bulletins, establishing a resource library and a "bank" of individuals and agencies with expertise in the field.

Support is also available from the American Bar Association, which encourages local bar associations to work with community groups to develop alternatives to confinement. Some seed money grants are available through the ABA's BASICS Program (Bar Association Support to Improve Correctional Services). Their particular emphasis is on Community Mediation Programs, Pretrial Intervention and Mutual Agreement Programming in Probation, though BASICS is also open to many variants.

RESOURCES

Women's Prison Association & Hopper Home, 110 Second Avenue, New York, New York 10003.

Newgate for Women, 341 Dayton Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55102 (Office: Newgate Education and Research Center, Inc., 430 Oak Grove, Suite B-12, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403).

Pi House, Inc., (Community Corrections Center for Women), 581 Portland Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55100.

Women's Community Center, YWCA, 1118 5th Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101.

Women, Inc., 570 Warren Street, Roxbury, Massachusetts 02152.

Sojourner Residence, 411 Seventh Street, West Palm Beach, Florida 33400.

Women's Residential Facility, 3118 Cottage Grove, Des Moines, Iowa 50311 (Administrative Offices of Des Moines Project: Fifth Judicial District Department of Court Services, 1000 College Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50314).

Women's Pretrial Release Program, Orange County Jail, Correctional Programs Section, 1 North Court Street, Orlando, Florida 32801.

Middlesex County Women's Jail Project, Sheriff's Department, 17th Floor, Superior Courthouse, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141.

Offender Aid Program, Central Piedmont Community College, Elizabeth Avenue at Kings Drive, P.O. Box 40009, Charlotte, North Carolina 28204.

Pretrial Intervention Program, Administrative Office of the Courts, State House Annex, Trenton, New Jersey 08625.

Bay Area Committee for Women Offenders, c/o Kay Nollenberger, 1541 Oxford, #207, Berkeley, California 95116.

Women's Jail Study Group, c/o Naneen Karraker, Western Moratorium on Prison Construction, Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, 1251 Second Avenue, San Francisco, California 94122.

National Moratorium on Prison Construction, 3106 Mt. Pleasant Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20010.

The Miriam Center, 115 N. 35th Avenue, Omaha, Nebraska 68131 (or c/o YWCA, 2016 Cass Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68102).

The Pretrial Services Resource Center, 1010 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20005.

BASICS (Bar Association Support to Improve Correctional Services), American Bar Association, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Horizon House, 1869 North 25th Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53205.

Aftercare

When we think of programs for women in jails, we tend too often to make them jailbound -- beginning and ending during incarceration. Many jailers have expressed frustration and resignation at not being able to offer long-range services similar to those offered in state and federal prisons. Unfortunately, at the same time, they shut the door on community-based services.

Almost 100% of jailed women will be released back to their communities, some within a few weeks, some after a couple years. The ratio of incarcerated women versus women ex-offenders is nearly ten to one,[1] and problems for women ex-offenders can be enormous -- regaining custody of children, continuing educational programs, adjusting to the renewed freedom and responsibilities, social contacts, money, housing, clothes, a job. These problems of reentry can be addressed by halfway houses, offender self-help groups, and volunteer programs.

The International Halfway House Association has developed guidelines regarding administration, program, and personnel. Standards outline how to make the facility a legal entity, requirements regarding physical size and location, and offender involvement in reintegration planning. IHHA is available for technical assistance in establishing or improving halfway houses.

The Elizabeth Fry Center (named for the nineteenth-century English Quaker) in Los Angeles is an unusually open halfway house. Curfews are lenient, and women can leave when they are ready. Staff members help women find permanent housing, jobs, and educational programs, and contact is often maintained even after the women leave. Three counseling sessions (house meeting, small group, and one-to-one) are mandatory each week, but otherwise rules are kept to a minimum in the belief that women should rely on themselves rather than on rules.

Community support is vital to developing a halfway house, but the neutralization of community opposition takes work. One program that has successfully dealt with the community is Talbert House for Women in Cincinnati. Talbert House has been accepted by its neighbors, which can be attributed to staff laying the proper groundwork. Months before the house opened, community meetings were held, neighbors oriented to the program, and community residents involved in planning. Cincinnati leaders also serve on the Talbert House Board of Directors.

In Oakland, California, Vocare opened as a nonprofit corporation in March 1972, renovating an old convalescent home. The initial skeptical reactions of neighbors was appeased by public relations efforts by the staff and residents, together with reassurances from the Police Department. Commitment to employment opportunities is their top priority, followed by involvement in a vocational and/or educational training program. Women contribute $15-$22.50 per week, on a sliding scale. Four staff counselors provide 24-hour coverage.

---

[1] In California, 215,000 offenders are on probation and parole at any given time, compared with 25,000 in institutions.

The Junior League spearheaded a halfway house in York, Pennsylvania, opening Atkins House in July 1976 after nearly two years of community development. Board members went door to door to gain neighborhood support. The local vocational-technical high school was enlisted for free labor during renovations, and contributions from various organizations completely furnished the house. Women (capacity of eight) are assisted in finding employment, educational or job training, or volunteer opportunities. One-quarter of their incomes goes to each: restitution costs, the county, savings, spending money. Three staff members provide 24-hour coverage; Atkins House operates on a $34,000 annual budget (in addition to a one-time $20,000 Junior League grant toward the cost of the house).

Green Hope Residence in New York was developed by a Roman Catholic nun, Sister Mary Nerney, as a result of her involvement with a Sisters' social justice lobby called the Network. Green Hope opened in June 1975 in a renovated convent, for women who had no place to go. Over 200 women have lived at Green Hope on a voluntary basis; only ten have been returned to jail since 1975. The home offers four to six months of individual, group and family counseling, vocational counseling and placement, parenting workshops, and assistance in reestablishing families.

In Washington, D.C., the Washington Half-Way Home for Women actively involves residents in ongoing community relations, with women encouraged to participate in radio and TV talk shows. Originally developed for female narcotics addicts, the home encourages self-reliance and the development of new social contacts with the outside community.

The Women's Prison Project of the Portland, Oregon, YWCA began in July 1973, with housing for ex-offenders at the Y, as well as assistance in locating a job, personal counseling, and a six-week stipend to aid in their transition. In your community, the use of YWCA facilities may reduce problems with zoning regulations and building codes, inasmuch as they are already licensed as boarding homes.

Honey Knopp of the Prisoner Visitation and Support Committee (a coalition of 20 national religious and socially concerned groups) has opened her home as "a place to come to" for one, two, or as many as five ex-offenders at a time. "Decompression" at the Knopps' home in Connecticut has lasted from a few weeks to one or two years, giving ex-offenders a family environment as well as help in finding jobs. Though they cannot take people with alcohol or drug problems, they find self-help peer community alternatives for them.

Similarly, in Lucas County, Ohio, the Woman Offender Services Bureau links women offenders with volunteers in the community, to offer temporary shelter and human contact to newly released women.

Self-help organizations, such as the Fortune Society in New York, utilize ex-offender counselors to work with newly released women (and men) in transition. Others such as Still Doing Time in Chicago (for black women) also offer advocacy, job development, educational counseling, and support drawn from the shared prison experience. In Springfield, Mass., the Female Offender Program at the YWCA launched a self-help organization independent of federal funding.

The YWCA program was developed by a woman ex-offender, with the group focusing on shared resources, information exchange, and deinstitutionalization of services.

Still Doing Time publishes several "after jail" handbooks, written by and for women ex-offenders. Self-help organizations recognize that peer pressure from the streets can turn a woman back to drugs, prostitution, and crime in a hurry, and by mutual support and resource sharing, ex-offenders can work together to go straight.

Volunteer programs that offer long-term, one-to-one support have proven effective in many communities, helping women bridge the difficult transition from jail to freedom. In 1960, a young Municipal Court Judge in Royal Oak, Michigan, Keith J. Leenhouts, corralled eight friends to work with offenders on a one-to-one basis, as a condition of probation and parole. Misdemeanants were required to meet regularly with their appointed volunteer counselors, developing many long-term friendships amidst an awareness of new (straight) social networks. Leenhouts' program later expanded, and was replicated in other communities, including Denver, where the volunteer program dropped the number of persons in the Denver County Jail from 1,000 prior to 1966 to about half that number in 1969.

In Lincoln, Nebraska, citizen volunteers have impacted on recidivism: 10% for offenders with volunteer sponsors versus 52.2% for those without. The effectiveness of Lincoln's volunteer counselors is credited to a selective screening process, enhancing the compatability of the matches. Volunteers are also required to participate in a ten-hour training course in counseling and crisis intervention skills.

Another variation on the volunteer concept is the Woman-to-Woman (W-2) program in Ohio. Women offenders in jail are matched with women volunteers (approximately 100 across the state), helping share the struggle for jobs, housing, regaining custody of children, continuing the GED course started in jail, etc. An ex-inmate knows her sponsor will respond to her calls for help, and that the relationship is not just part of her job. Friendships develop that are long-lasting. The program is similar in concept to Big Sisters.

Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR) offers intensive training for volunteers working one-to-one in the New York City jails. Offered in collaboration with the Fortune Society (originally), the typical training cycle consists of up to 25 volunteers in 72 hours of training over a six-week period. Volunteer trainees are reality tested with every game imaginable -- homosexual rape, seductive pimp types for demure women, racial slurs and epithets, money hustles and much more. The rationale is based on the necessity for honesty and openness, in the jails and outside. Regular feedback sessions are also required.

Women released from jails face the complicated problems of nonacceptance by society, peer pressure from old friends on the streets, custody suits, lack of money, and few developed opportunities. If programs begun at the jail are to have effect, aftercare services must be an integral component of rehabilitation. Any program, self-help, volunteer, or residential, that helps a woman through the transition is going to give more women ex-offenders a fighting chance to make the change.

RESOURCES

The Elizabeth Fry Center, Inc., 3429 W. Olympic Blvd., P.O. Box 19677, Los Angeles, California 90019.

Talbert House, 344 McGregor Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45219.

Vocare, 2849 Delaware Street, Oakland, California 94607.

Atkins House, 307 East King Street, York, Pennsylvania 17400.

Green Hope Residence, 448 East 119th Street, New York, New York 10035.

Women's Prison Project, YWCA, 1111 S.W. Tenth Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97205.

Prisoner Visitation and Support Committee, Suite 300, 2016 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103.

The Fortune Society, 29 East 22nd Street, New York, New York 10010.

Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR of New York City, Inc.), 491 Hudson Street, New York, New York 10014.

Still Doing Time, Inc., 4545 South Drexel Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60653.

Female Offender Program, YWCA, 26 Howard Street, Springfield, Massachusetts 01105.

VIP (Volunteers in Prevention, Prosecution, Probation, Prison, Parole), a division of the National Council on Crime and Deliquency, 200 Washington Square Plaza, Royal Oak, Michigan 48067.

Volunteers in Probation, State Probation Administration, P.O. Box 94622, Lincoln, Nebraska 68509.

Woman-to-Woman (W-2), 935 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 41205.

International Halfway House Association, 2525 Victory Parkway, Cincinnati, Ohio 45206.

Washington Half-Way Home for Women, Inc., 1816 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

Lucas County Criminal Justice Regional Planning Unit, Woman Offender Task Force, 316 N. Michigan Street, Toledo, Ohio 43624.

Women Offender Services Bureau of the Lucas County Sheriff's Department, 1622 Spielbusch, Toledo, Ohio 43624.

Barriers to Rehabilitation

We are involved in a system which defeats itself, in a system where the work ethic and the values of our society applaud hard work and productive activity; while at the same time denying exactly that opportunity to do hard work to persons we expect, in fact demand, to act responsibly. We try to rehabilitate, and then we place barriers to rehabilitation.

Donald J. Horowitz, Senior Assistant
Attorney General
State of Washington

Recidivism among women offenders consistently runs high, and several salient factors present barriers to meaningful rehabilitation: the powerlessness of women in jail, the lack of trained professionals, standard arguments about the work habits of women, restrictive laws for ex-offenders, and the social stigma.

Powerlessness is an inherent barrier to meaningful rehabilitation programs for women in jails, and women might take the lead of the Prisoner's Union in California, which represents more than 20,000 inmates and ex-offenders to collectively bargain with the corrections department for institutional change.[1] With offices outside, to free the negotiating from the possibility of prisoner harrassment, the Prisoners' Union is slowly gaining acceptance as a legal, viable, nonviolent mechanism for change -- opening up the institutions to watchdogging by outsiders. Prisoners' Unions have also been formed in North Carolina, Wisconsin, Oklahoma, and Minnesota.

Women in jails might also join forces with female correctional officers to collectively, responsibly increase the power base of both groups. A Community Involvement Group (CIG) was formed at the James River Correctional Center in Virginia in 1973, with inmates and employees meeting weekly to develop in-house and community programs. CIG, though a program in a men's prison, could be replicable in women's jails, giving women inmates and officers a stronger voice in program planning and opening up the facility to greater community involvement. CIG has sponsored institutional seminars, tournaments, and public speaking at youth correctional centers. Its potential strength lies in the collective power of women, working together to bring about institutional change.

Women correctional officers share the inmates' powerlessness and often lack professional training. Students who are today being trained to take their places as tomorrow's correctional workers and administrators, police personnel, lawyers, etc., will probably obtain their knowledge about female offenders from the introductory criminology textbooks used in their classroom work.[2]

Unfortunately, treatment of women offenders in the majority of criminology texts is laced with stereotypes and myths. Discriminatory, sexist, racist practices in the criminal justice system are the inevitable result. A few colleges have begun to stimulate interest in courses and workshops dealing with women offenders, including American University in Washington, D.C., offering a 15-week course on women offenders; Georgetown University, sponsoring a conference on women offenders; George Washington University, featuring women in their "Introduction to Corrections" course; and the University of Alabama's Sexual Justice course. More criminal justice departments need to develop courses that will offer a better understanding of women offenders' needs and problems.

---

[1] The Prisoners' Union publishes *The Outlaw*, available free to any inmate. The January/February 1976 issue (vol. 5, no. 1) published a 30-point guideline ("Don't Criticize, Organize," p. 15) on how to organize a prisoners' union in your area.

[2] Nancy Koser Wilson and Constance M. Rigby, "Is Crime a Man's World?" p. 132.

The training of criminal justice administrators is as discriminatory as the employment prospects all women face. All working women are stigmatized with myths such as "Women are sick all the time," or "Women will get pregnant and leave." The realities are that employees in high-level jobs generally have fewer absences than those at low-level jobs, regardless of sex.[1] Women at higher levels also rate favorably in terms of labor turnover. The jobs are more interesting and rewarding, diminishing the need for escape from the deadly boredom of low-paying work, where the majority of women workers are concentrated.

In terms of women offenders, their job stability and interest will be higher, the more their jobs hold financial rewards, social esteem, and creativity. Placing women offenders in entry-level jobs (secondary labor market jobs) with no prospects of advancement becomes an enormous barrier to their embracing the new lifestyle. Placement in jobs such as waitressing or store clerking will only serve to confirm the patterns of absenteeism and labor turnover so common to the low-paying jobs.

Ex-offenders also face the same problems of all working mothers: the need for day care services for their children. Between 30%-40% of female ex-offenders will need a day care center, and without it, they cannot actively seek work or go to school.[2] Helping a woman find appropriate day care, including family day care and day care cooperatives, must be a priority upon her release from jail. A study of WIN program clients in 16 cities revealed that nearly 40% did not look for jobs because they had no knowledge of day care facilities.[3]

Career options for ex-offenders are limited because of laws, regulations, and practices that arbitrarily limit the employment opportunities of persons with a criminal record. At the very time when the person needs and wants a job, ex-offenders face the collateral consequences of their crimes: restrictions on licensing for certain occupations, bonding, even their driver's license. We try to rehabilitate, and then we place barriers to rehabilitation, and in fact, initiate an active impetus back to a life of crime.[4]

Nearly 2,000 different statutory provisions across the country bar ex-offenders from employment: work that requires a security clearance (such as defense industries), jobs that involve trust or the handling of money, and occupations that require "good moral character," such as cosmetologists, practical nurses, or dental hygienists carry licenses that specifically bar ex-offenders. Such licenses are being challenged on the basis that they do not correlate the occupation with the nature of the crime committed, and that once a person has done her time, she has paid her dues. Yet by restricting ex-offenders from about half the jobs in this country, we are, in effect, giving them a life sentence.

---

[1] Elizabeth Duncan Koontz, *Facts About Women's Absenteeism and Labor Turnover*, U.S. Department of Labor, p. 6.

[2] Forty-four percent of women offenders have children under the age of five.

[3] *Community Programs for Women: Cost and Economic Considerations*, p. 21.

[4] Attorney General's Office of the State of Washington, *Removing Offender Employment Restrictions*, ABA, p. 7.

In 1956, the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Schwarz* v. *Board of Bar Examiners*, held that state-imposed qualifications for an occupation must be job related. Yet states have been slow to respond with remedial legislation. Florida enacted a general law in 1971 that provides that a crime shall not be a bar to a license unless it directly relates to the occupation sought. Other states are slowly following suit. If you are interested in pursuing the legislative channels, several options are available to remove the barriers:

1. Pardon (discretionary).

2. Automatic Restoration of Rights (13 states have enacted such procedures: Colorado, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming), including the right to vote and hold public office on completion of parole, probation, or sentence.

3. Restoration of Rights upon Application. New York's "Certificate of Relief from Disabilities" and "Certificate of Good Conduct" are examples.

4. Expungement and Sealing of Records.

5. The Courts, through challenges to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Legislature (such as Florida and Illinois).

6. Attorney General's Opinion (Maryland).

7. Governor's Executive Order (Maine, Rhode Island, Ohio).[1]

Some remedial legislation has removed barriers, while other laws have merely modified the restrictions. Your local League of Women Voters or Common Cause organizations could help you assess the laws in your state and pursue the appropriate legislative channels. Rehabilitation programs may begin in the jails, but lobbying with state legislators and public and private employers must be tackled as a collateral long-range project.

Perhaps the most insurmountable barrier is that put up by the lifetime stigma of "ex-offender." When we hang that label around a woman's neck, like the scarlet letter branded on the heroine of Hawthorne's novel, we make it impossible for her to be an ordinary citizen. To denounce her for her behavior may satisfy our need to disapprove of her crime, but it increases the probability that she cannot become a citizen in good standing.[2] The internal barriers we carry around in our heads are as devastating as the legal restrictions. It is our collective responsibility to try to welcome their reintegration back to our communities, and to keep on trying.

---

[1] James E. Bowers, *Removing Offender Employment Restrictions*, ABA, pp. 110-117.

[2] John Conrad, "Reintegration: Practice in Search of a Theory, *Reintegration of the Offender into the Community*, p. 22.

RESOURCES

College Courses on Women Offenders

American University, Washington, D.C. 20016.

Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007.

George Washington University, Washington, D.C. 20052.

University of Alabama, Box 2968, University, Alabama 35486.

Legal Case

Schwarz v. Board of Bar Examiners, 353 U.S. 232 (1956).

Bonding

The Federal Bonding Program, U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Washington, D.C. 20210.

Licensing

Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, American Bar Association, 1800 M St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Employment

Ex-Offender Employment Program, National Alliance of Businessmen, 1730 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Prisoners' Unions

The Prisoners' Union, 1315 18th St., San Francisco, California 94107.

Minnesota Prisoners' Union, 1427 Washington Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55405.

North Carolina Prisoners' Labor Union, Box 2842, Durham, North Carolina 27705.

Wisconsin Prisoners' Union, 953 Jennifer Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53403.

Oklahoma Prisoners' Union, Box 25154, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73103.

Community Involvement Group

James River Correctional Center, State Farm, Virginia 23160.

Community Involvement

When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on his glorious throne. Before him will be gathered all the nations, and he will separate them one from another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats, and he will place the sheep to his right hand, but the goats to the left. Then the King will say to those at his right hand, "Come, O blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, I was a stranger, and you welcomed me, I was naked and you clothed me, I was sick and you visited me, I was in prison and you came to me.... Truly I say unto you, as you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me."

Matthew 25:31-46

How many times have unbelievable conditions in jails been exposed? How many times has the American Correctional Association passed resolutions decrying jail conditions? The bottom line to all the rhetoric is that women are still being kept out of sight. It's as if society considers them garbage, and puts them in a can and slams the lid. Then society can't see them. But they're still there.

San Francisco County Sheriff Richard Hongisto said, "We have to remember that people in jail are inevitably the poor and powerless. They don't have the power to change the system by themselves."[1] Women inside need women outside to help.

There are a number of things people in the community can do:

1. Visit the jail. Assess the conditions yourself. Jails are government institutions, paid for by our taxes, and responsible to us as citizens. They should be as accessible as the courts. Jail administrators prefer to operate in secrecy and without scrutiny. The most important step is direct contact and observation.

Write down comments by inmates, guards, social workers, and the sheriff about educational programs, work release opportunities, security, visiting, contact with children, health, library, censorship of mail, medication, sanitation, and food. Handbooks are available to help you systematically evaluate the facility and services for women.

The Correctional Solutions "Thresholds" program brings community people into the county jail to see the conditions under which inmates live, as well as to help inmates learn coping skills. American jails are not watchdogged enough by their local communities. Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Finland have active organizations of ex-offenders, students, professors, business professionals, politicians, and housewives who regularly visit the jails to ensure decent treatment of inmates.[2]

Despite the sensitivity of jail social workers, psychiatrists, and correctional staff members, their first loyalty is to their employers, not to the inmates. They are not in a position to rag the system without jeopardizing their jobs.[3] The responsibility lies with the public, which authorizes the inhumane, inequitable treatment of women inmates by their silence.

The media needs to take a more active role, through uncensored interviews with inmates and jail officials. The American Bar Association publishes a booklet on story ideas, covering a wide range of subjects, to aid reporters interested in criminal justice.

---

[1] Kathryn Burkhart, *Women in Prison*, p. 35.

[2] Ronald Goldfarb, *Jails*, p. 140.

[3] Strategy and Action Commission, Massachusetts Council of Churches, *A Critique of Minimum Standards for County Jails*, p. 4.

2. Talk with judges, probation and parole officers, your local police chief. Spend a day in court and watch the sentencing patterns.

3. Invite judges, sheriffs, wardens, correctional educators, parole/probation officers, prosecutors, police officers, and ex-offenders to speak to your group. Ask them how your group can help.

Several good films are available for rental at nominal cost, portraying the special problems of women offenders. Collaborate with several other agencies or organizations and bring in a national speaker.

4. Get directly involved. Know your group's personality as well as the local jail administrator's. You may be able to cooperatively develop a program, or you may have to instigate legal action, which means an adversary position.

Community volunteers are the mainstays of most jail programs across the country: two-thirds are exclusively staffed by volunteers.[1] Coordinate with other volunteers already interested in, or involved with the institution.

Groups with varying ranges of expertise, interest, and organizational capacities can help. The tasks to be accomplished range from fighting for new laws, to planning and directing a full-scale rehabilitation program, to driving a woman's mother to the jail on visiting day.[2] Different groups have different strengths. Groups with connections in the state legislature might consider a project to eliminate or modify the restrictive licensing regulations, particularly for meaningful jobs. Groups such as the YWCA or Junior League and others with strong community ties might lobby for women offenders at local schools and training academies, or develop a community-based residential facility. Professional women's organizations might conduct employment surveys in their community, to determine which employers would hire women ex-offenders, and which companies have discriminatory employment application forms.

Encourage local officials to appoint knowledgeable women to manpower advisory councils, to represent women offenders' needs in planning upcoming training programs. Make sure women are represented on community councils that allocate federal monies.

Churches can and should get involved. In 1956, Ernest L. V. Shelley (National Information Center on Volunteerism) introduced church volunteers into the Michigan prison system to teach, counsel, offer religious services, recreation and cultural activities. The program attracted national attention, and the volunteer/lay counseling program was later developed further by Municipal Judge Keith Leenhouts in Royal Oak, Michigan.

---

[1] *The Nation's Jails: A Report on the Census of Jails from the 1972 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails*, p. 14.

[2] Virginia A. McCarthur, *From Convict to Citizen: Programs for the Woman Offender*, p. 1.

According to Dr. Shelley, "If it lives up to its obligations as the conscience of society, church pronouncements will have a sting and bite to them -- they will hurt, as a conscience is supposed to hurt."[1] The Massachusetts Council of Churches and the Benedict Center for Criminal Justice (Wisconsin) supported by the Capuchins, the Dominican Sisters of Racine, and the School Sisters of St. Francis have published survey reports on conditions and facilities. The Benedict Center also sponsors educational, counseling, and watchdogging services for women at the Milwaukee County jail. In Ohio, author Ysabel Rennie and others at the St. Mark's Episcopal Church in Columbus undertook a decade of reform efforts on behalf of inmates at the Ohio Penitentiary, successfully instigating numerous significant reforms.

The business community also shares a responsibility for jail conditions and needs to get involved. According to William G. Murphy, President and Chief Executive Officer of the National Alliance of Businessmen (on loan from Mutual of Omaha), "The police can catch criminals, the judges can try them, the wardens can warehouse them, the psychologists can prepare them, the teachers can train them. But only the business community can hire them. And without a job, the tragic circle may well begin again and again."[2] The business community has the greatest weapon against criminality: it's called a job. Survey after survey proves the dramatic connection between finding meaningful work and staying out of jail.

The question is not to ask innocent bystanders, business, and organized labor to make sacrifices to rehabilitate women offenders. We are asking a system that helps create the conditions of hard-core unemployment, poverty, and crime to help compensate for its actions, by hiring the victims of discrimination, poverty, sexism, and racism.

To survive in the community without returning to crime, women offenders will need a lot of support from people who care. Volunteers in the community can help cut through red tape, find housing, health care, legal assistance, day care, jobs. Most ex-offenders are people whom nobody cared about from the time they were very small, and plain human kindness and concern are the first of their needs. Volunteers don't need specific counseling training, only a compassion for other people.[3] Because of their vulnerable powerless position, women inmates know only too well the "waiting for false promises" routine. They need time to build a trusting relationship with people on the outside, and condescending "do-gooders" had best change their own attitudes instead of further demeaning already oppressed women with self-righteous volunteerism.

The strength of community involvement lies in the potential for long-term, one-to-one concern and support. Programs that begin with federal funding

---

[1] Ivan H. Scheier, *The Church as Volunteer in Courts and Corrections*, p. 2.

[2] John R. Armore and Joseph D. Wolfe, *Dictionary of Desperation*, National Alliance of Businessmen, pp. 5-6.

[3] Marie Buckley, *Breaking into Prison*, p. 43.

should immediately move to massive citizen and volunteer involvement, according to Judge Keith J. Leenhouts. Community volunteers can be a voice with the local government, health agencies, employers, landlords, and courts after the federal funds have run out.

Educate yourself. Recruit others. Develop a plan that meets the needs in your own community. Officials at the model Des Moines project say that in order to understand what makes a program innovative, one must compare it to the system it replaced, rather than to other existing systems. Your own community has a wealth of resources from which support can be coalesced and services developed. Jail reform takes time, but women outside can help women inside make incarceration time more bearable, and after-release opportunities more hopeful.

Jail Survey Handbooks

The County Jail: A Handbook for Citizen Action, Friends Suburban Project, P.O. Box 462, Concordville, Pennsylvania 19331.

"County Jail Survey," in 1/1/73 issue of *Liberty to the Captives,* Mennonite Central Committee, 409 West 11th Street, Newton, Kansas 67114 (from April/May 1972 issue of the *Penal Digest International).*

Community Volunteer Program

"Thresholds," Correctional Solutions, Inc., 22 Ellsworth Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139.

Media Booklet on Story Ideas

Sally Jacobsen, *How to Measure the Quality of Criminal Justice: Story Ideas,* American Bar Association, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Films

Women: The Forgotten Minority, c/o Ms. Corinna Aragon, Minority Women's Caucus, 8190 Bradburn Drive, Westminster, Colorado 80030.

Release (produced by Church Women United in U.S.A.), Odeon Films, Inc., 1619 Broadway, New York, New York 10019.

Women in Prison, Carousel Films, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, New York 10036.

Who Is Tracy Williams? Department of Audiovisual Services, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

A Prison Film: Still Living, Department of Audiovisual Services, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

Church Involvement

Prisoners and Prisons in Massachusetts, Massachusetts Council of Churches, 14 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02108.

The Women Offender in Wisconsin Jails: A Survey, The Benedict Center for Criminal Justice, 1015 North Ninth Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233.

Ysabel Rennie, c/o St. Mark's Episcopal Church, 2151 Dorset Street, Arlington, Ohio 45814.

3. Model Project: Female Offender Program, Springfield, Massachusetts

Sheriffs are all politicians: either they bend and start to add services, or they won't get elected. Most communities, including Springfield, won't buy the Smokey the Bear bit anymore. The public is demanding more from its public institutions than just warehousing.

Jay Ashe
Deputy Master of Human Services
Hampden County Jail and House
of Correction
(interview, July 6, 1977)

Background

In 1974 a young Boston College social worker upset the Springfield, Mass., political machine, and beat the entrenched security-minded sheriff in Hampden County. The election marked the beginning of a significant change in county corrections in this industrial, Connecticut Valley community. The milestone election was preceded by months of groundwork by the Council of Churches to open up the institution. When Michael J. Ashe took office in January 1975, the time was right for reform.

Though Ashe had never been inside a jail before, his social work background (adolescent group homes) prepared him for the monumental task of transforming the 88-year-old dilapidated jail from one of high security to one with a humanitarian perspective. Physical renovations were also a high priority.

One of Ashe's first concerns was for women inmates. At the time of his election, women were incarcerated in a far corner of the jail, a dozen or more women each day sharing the same dreary, suffocating open dormatory room. Lack of space and inadequate staff coverage precluded their movement outside the room. No programs of any kind were available, not even basic physical exercise or chapel services. Women incarcerated at the Hampden County Jail spent their days, and months, watching television, smoking, playing cards, sleeping. They had no privacy, no physical mobility, no opportunities for improving their skills.

The philosophical difference between Ashe and his predecessor unnerved the correctional officers, who quickly moved to form a union to protect their jobs. They feared (as is so often the case) that the new sheriff would fire his inherited staff and replace them with friends, relatives, and political allies. Most, including the female officers, did not share Ashe's humanist perspective and each proposed reform measure was met with resistance.

The only "family" appointment of significance was younger brother J. John "Jay" Ashe in a newly created position of Deputy Master of Human Services. A sensitive social worker, Jay provided a timely stimulant for reforming the women's unit.

Community visitors had rarely seen the inside of the jail, and the women's unit had been the most inaccessible. Correctional staff looked askance at the prospect of nonjail staff entering the women's unit to talk with the women inmates.

But Mike and Jay Ashe bravely enlisted the help of the Springfield YWCA, to collectively investigate the nature of women's special needs. The YWCA was contacted because it was a responsible, stable community women's organization. In Springfield, it had been serving women for over 100 years and was believed to be the third oldest YWCA in the country. Staff from the Y were not going to exploit or embarrass the new sheriff, or abuse his openness.

A small group from the YWCA began a series of informal conversations with the women inmates and correctional officers. Our middle-class sensibilities

were outraged at what we heard and saw: young women who received no health treatment from the jail staff, no recreational activities, no job training or education, inconsistent punishments and rewards, and who, at young ages, were already hardened to an unjust, sexist, racist system.

To broaden community support for change, the YWCA contacted the local office of the National Alliance of Businessmen. Several months earlier, NAB had sponsored a "Career Motivation Institute" (CMI) for male inmates and the community, discussing labor market conditions, job training, job-readiness issues.

At NAB we met Stelle Fontaine, one of the first of many strong allies for our emerging work with women offenders. An energetic grandmother who had run for political office years before, Stelle rapidly embraced our cause, and channeled our concerns to Regional NAB Executive Richard Wells in Boston, and later to John Armore, NAB's Vice President of Ex-Offender Programs in Washington, D.C. After coaxing, cajoling, pleading, and insisting, John agreed to sponsor a six-week series of discussions. It was the first time NAB had taken a hard look at women's issues, and the national office closely watched the outcome of our program.

The series was designed by the YWCA and the jail. It was the first opportunity for women inmates and community members to meet and openly share their biases, prejudices, fears, anger, and hope regarding reform.

The series attracted over 200 community men and women, social workers, politicians, housewives, judges, police officers, from businesses, schools, churches, women's clubs. It was the first time most had been inside a jail, and few were even aware that women were housed there. Many were nervous about being inside a jail; women inmates were suspicious about the ramifications of negative comments. However, most participants gradually relaxed and talked freely in the group discussions.

Topics ranged from labor market surveys to employee/employer expectations, women's liberation, and assertiveness to special reintegrative needs such as child care and health services.

The six-week series was successful, but explosive. Women inmates had never before had an opportunity to express their anger. "How am I supposed to stay out of jail if people like you won't give me a job," screamed the women. Community guests had never seen or felt the extent of the discrimination and hopelessness among the women. The impetus for change was building in our collective anger.

Our exploration process was also supplemented with tours of other county jails and state prisons for women. We saw the marked contrast between relaxed security in prisons holding convicted felons versus the militaristic setting of jails holding misdemeants and pretrial detainees. Rhetorically we asked: why can't a jail be more like a prison?

The YWCA then settled down with the jail to evaluate our findings. Through informal conversations, the explosive CMI series, and tours of other facilities, we pinpointed several key needs: education, vocational training,

work release, recreation, and follow-up after release. Also apparent were health, child custody, money management, and housing.

The two organizations collaboratively developed a proposed program, and submitted it to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, through their Special Discretionary Funds. LEAA would fund 90%, with a 10% local match required. The YWCA committed itself to raise that matching money, and it was this financial commitment that impressed Sheriff Ashe. "The agency was not just talking good, they were committing money to the project," he said. During the first year, it was unlikely that Hampden County would commit funds to the project. The Commissioners approved receipt of the federal funds on the condition that the county would incur no additional costs.

The relationship between the Hampden County Jail and the YWCA was shaky during the exploration year. Two directors left the agency because of their inability to relate to the needs of women offenders. The Board of Directors struggled with their own class biases, and had to be shamed into attending the CMI series. For nearly a year, the impetus and trust was generated by the Director of Financial Development, a woman who spent many of her free hours at the jail, solidifying the Y commitment, keeping the partnership alive. That woman is the author of this book.

Before the Female Offender Program began officially, the YWCA staggered with the realities of corrections work. Postrelease housing was a need for many women, and the YWCA was used several times unsuccessfully. Resident ex-offenders set up prostitution businesses, using YWCA phones. Board Members reeled as pimps sat in the lobby.

Jobs were another concern, and placement at the YWCA was tried through manpower training funds. Tutors were lined up. Personal money was "loaned," to tide them over. Our courageous new altruism failed. Our integrated service program was not in place, and the women were not prepared.

We began to feel the magnitude of the reintegration process: how does a woman get an apartment with a welfare voucher, when most landlords won't accept them ... what does a woman do for cash until her first paycheck or welfare check arrives ... how does she unwind after months in jail, without violating her parole ... how does she work through the familiarity of old street habits?

The YWCA as a century-old agency was quickly redefining itself, and the Board of Directors tacitly agreed to support the new program. We were all groping in unfamiliar ground, trying to learn new ways.

In July 1976 a sensitive new director for the proposed Female Offender Program, Roz Canter, was hired by the YWCA. A young, articulate feminist, with prior experience in corrections, Roz quickly developed rapport at the jail and the YWCA, bridging that critical gap. A month after Roz was hired, LEAA gave the official go-ahead for the program. A day after that notification, Sheriff Ashe received word that the $390,000 grant for renovating the women's unit had been approved. A year's work was finally coming to fruition.

The Female Offender Program would introduce four new social workers into the women's unit. The renovations would double the floor space, add air conditioning, cubicle dividers, and a separate entrance from the outside. We had come from a point of knowing little about women offenders' special problems, to concretely addressing some identifiable problems.

We had overcome our own ignorance and were beginning to build a community of caring allies. Such a community cannot be legislated from above: state guidelines for jails had been on record for two years in Massachusetts without noticeable effect. In Springfield, a few people had fought courageously for growth and reform. We had opened a pandora's box, and people outside and people inside were rattling the cages.

Said Sheriff Michael Ashe, "In the past, this jail had been feeding the women's patterns of self-degradation. The move toward community-based corrections will help keep the jail more honest, with less of a chance to set deep scars on people. The work of the YWCA brought us to a point where we could start to expose women to meaningful opportunities, to reverse the destructive trend which the unjust society had started."

Program Design

The Hampden County Jail/YWCA Female Offender Program was designed as a collaboration between the two organizations. LEAA funds were funneled through the county treasury, but services were subcontracted to the YWCA.

Roz Canter, a staff person at the YWCA, shared coordination responsibilities with Jay Ashe at the Hampden County Jail. These lines of authority were developed for several reasons: (a) to keep the jail honest; (b) to enhance input from community volunteers, through the YWCA network; (c) to underscore the jail's openness; (d) to coordinate in-house and aftercare services at the YWCA.

The Female Offender Program focuses on four components:

1. Intake: the program offers individualized services, based on each woman's specific needs. Previously, intake information was only obtained on sentenced women (approximately 25 per year), and then only of a legalistic nature. The 150 or more pretrial detainees had little or no information taken on their immediate or long-term needs.

The intake process for both classes of inmates is facilitated by the full-time Intake Counselor, the one staff person in the program whose salary is paid directly from LEAA funds through the county. Eventually, she would become director of the women's unit, overseeing treatment and security staffs, with her salary assumed by the county in the second year of the program.

Intake information is obtained on every incarcerated woman, *including* those held on pretrial status. Two separate intake forms are used: the first to ascertain each woman's immediate concerns (custody and care of her children, legal problems, personal care, health needs, etc.); the second to develop an in-house program plan (education, job training, work release, health care, etc.) to meet her needs for positive reintegration.

Working with the Intake Counselor, each woman is apprised of the opportunities available while in jail, and together they determine what alternatives seem most appropriate. The ultimate decision regarding classes, activities, and tutoring lies with each woman. The Intake Counselor helps each woman assess her needs and interests, weighing her strengths and weaknesses for a realistic, achievable long-term plan.

2. Educational/Vocational Counseling: once a woman's needs are assessed, specialized educational and vocational programming is developed. Because each woman's needs are unique, one-to-one programming is developed. The relatively small daily population in the women's unit makes individualized programming possible.

Recognizing that most women inmates lack their high school diploma and have only a sporadic history of mainstream work, meaningful reintegration plans must be community based. A woman cannot be expected to pass her GED and learn a job skill during her brief stay at the jail.

Therefore, the direct, active involvement of community volunteers and schools is critical. Similarly, the opportunity for educational and vocational work release must be available for pretrial and sentenced women. A separate entrance to the women's unit was added during the renovations, eliminating the trafficking through the men's section and facilitating work release for women.

Though some "job readiness" sessions are offered at the jail, the program enlists community schools to carry on the majority of tutoring and training. With this direct involvement of outside agencies and volunteers, a wider range of services can be offered, in a context of in-house, aftercare continuity.

3. Recreation: for many women offenders, failure is a common experience. Recreational activities are essential for a variety of reasons: (a) to learn constructive use of leisure time; (b) to learn the experience of completing a project successfully; (c) to vent anger through activities such as exercise.

Though the Recreational Counselor may herself run some activities, the objective is to involve community members in programming. A wider range of activities can then be offered, and women given a range of new social contacts. Overall recreational programming addresses intellectual discussions, self-enrichment craft type activities, and physical sports.

In all areas, activities are planned that the women could continue on their own after release.

Dead time is a frequent problem in jails, particularly at night and on weekends. The recreational component addresses that problem through the active involvement of volunteers throughout the week.

4. Aftercare Counseling: working out of the nearby YWCA, the full-time Aftercare Counselor works with each woman on postrelease planning, with advocacy for her in a broad range of areas (legal, housing, employment, welfare, etc.). Each woman ex-offender is thereby offered a supportive ally outside the jail in the noncorrections environment of the YWCA. Counseling at the Y was developed to destigmatize ex-offender services: women of every description come to the YWCA for classes, residence, crisis services, meals, lectures. Ex-offenders spent too much of their lives being shuttled from offices stigmatizing them as social deviants.

Advocacy services are available to any woman who has been arrested or sentenced. The aftercare component is also offered as a resource for women from other correctional institutions, including the State Prison for Women in Framingham, as well as referrals from the courts.

The presence of four staff people, with massive volunteer and community involvement, increases the opportunity for each woman to find at least one caring person to whom she can relate.

The involvement of volunteers serves three purposes: first, to broaden the availability of services; second, to broaden the base for a caring community.

The more people who visit the jail, meet and work with the women, the greater the number of people who become *educated* about the real reintegrative needs of the women offenders and the nature of the criminal justice system. Third, volunteers serve as a form of insurance if federal funding disappears, a contingency that should always be anticipated. Trained volunteers may one day have to assume the bulk of responsibility.

Besides offering a new range of services to incarcerated women, the Female Offender Program also aims to reeducate correctional officers to the treatment function of their jobs, by direct involvement with program planning and implementation. Women officers were previously given only custodial responsibilities, under the supervision of male officers. Their professional growth is concomitant with the overall goals of the program.

If the Female Offender Program should lose its funding, the correctional staff would remain. Their understanding of a supportive, rather than punitive, environment enhances their own potential as agents for positive change.

The overall program was designed around the limitations of LEAA funding. LEAA's Part E, Special Discretionary Funds, was the only section that specifically mentions women offenders as a priority in the 1976 guidelines. Unfortunately, despite higher funding ceilings in other categories, LEAA would fund only up to $50,000.

As a result, this program was developed with two full-time (Intake and Aftercare Counselors) and three part-time counselors (educational/vocational, recreational, and project director).

When LEAA made its funding announcements for the Fiscal Year 1976-77, the YWCA/Hampden County Jail program was the only program for jailed women funded in Region I. Though the Female Offender Program did not have official "model" status, LEAA was to watch it closely.

Staff Training

Training for the Female Offender Program staff is ongoing. Initially, an intensive one-week orientation program was held at the Hampden County Jail, covering such topics as legal rights, interpersonal relations, human behavior, security, and introductions to correctional staff and human services programs.

The staff also visited the local courts, probation and parole offices to ascertain treatment of women offenders prior to incarceration, what information is collected, how cases are disposed, etc. Meetings were held with District and Superior Clerks of Courts to develop access to statistical data. Local judges and police departments were contacted, to develop working relationships.

On-site visits were also conducted to other institutions, including: Niantic (Conn.) State Prison for Women, Framingham (Mass.) State Prison for Women, Framingham House, Concord State Prison, Women, Inc. (Boston, Mass.), and New England Learning Center for Women in Transition. Staff also participated in a three-week program in Lawrence, Mass., for correctional officers' orientation.

Program Accomplishments

During the first year of the project, many anticipated and several unexpected accomplishments were realized, beyond the specific objectives outlined in the previous section:

1. Staff positively addressed the inherent sexism of the Hampden County Jail, with both male and female correctional officers increasingly aware of women offenders' needs. Blatant sexist slurs were minimized.

2. Several previous institutional "taboos" were rescinded, as a result of our collective education and the active presence of the program staff. Work release was introduced for women. Coeducational vocational training and educational classes were successfully sponsored, normalizing male/female relations.

3. Community awareness was enhanced, and the media was actively enlisted to follow our progress. Several feature newspaper articles were written, and an educational television special was presented.

The Project Director participated in the core planning committee of the Western Massachusetts Governor's Conference on the Employment of Ex-Offenders, and a workshop on the special needs of women was included in the program.

Public speaking at churches, women's clubs, men's service organizations, and schools brought before the public issues of concern to women offenders. Volunteers were recruited, donations and financial contributions solicited. The library for the women's unit was stocked with over 1,500 donated books; clothing in a wide range of sizes and styles was contributed to build a free wardrobe for any woman needing clothing upon release. Christmas gifts were generously given to help ease the pain and loneliness of the holidays.

The range of public involvement varied, from those who wished to become direct service volunteers, to those who expressed their support more comfortably from a distance, contributing money or material goods.

4. The program had impact on other correctional institutions in the state, as staff followed women inmates who had been transferred to other jails or the state prison in Framingham, and those released back to Springfield.

Renovations at the Hampden County Jail forced the relocation of women inmates to other jails in the state (Berkshire County in Pittsfield, Worcester County, and the accused unit at Framingham State Prison) for several months, and staff traveled to each facility regularly. Programs that were not normally available to incarcerated women at those institutions were offered to everyone, not just Hampden County inmates. Christmas parties, craft projects, rap sessions, postrelease planning, advocacy were among the services introduced at the other institutions. Administrative staffs at the other jails and prisons looked to the Female Offender Program to offer guidance regarding their own long-range planning.

Inmates at the Berkshire County Jail indicated a sense of loss when the Hampden County women were transferred back to the renovated Springfield jail; however, jail administrators were sensitized to the need for better programming in their women's unit. Officials at Framingham State Prison sought to develop a long-range collaboration of aftercare services for discharged women returning to Hampden County. We were not only broadening awareness in the Springfield area, but across the state as well.

5. The physical environment of the women's unit improved greatly through the renovations, aesthetically influenced by the Female Offender Program staff who worked with the contractor and jail officials. Color schemes, security issues, design ideas were impacted with a treatment perspective. The program staff solicited donations for furnishings, bedspreads, curtains, health and hospital equipment, and program supplies from supporters in the community.

6. Women ex-offenders became actively involved in program planning, with one woman, Darlene Mickiewicz, working for several months with YWCA staff to design a Female Offender Loan Fund. Two small grants (totalling $450) had previously been received from the Massachusetts Society for Discharged Prisoners; the fund was available to women on an interest-free loan basis.

Because the small fund limited loans to a maximum of $35, Darlene worked with YWCA staff to design a $10,000 self-sustaining fund, which would make loans up to $200 available to any woman ex-offender. Community support was developed from local bankers, businessmen executives, social workers, parole officers and church leaders. Darlene's leadership enlisted support from other women ex-offenders.

Ongoing discussions with women ex-offenders and community volunteers pointed out the need for services in areas we had previously overlooked: self-help as a long-range alternative to funded aftercare counseling (modeled after the work of the Fortune Society and Still Doing Time in Chicago). A halfway house alternative to incarceration facility was also explored in community and staff discussions.

Recognizing the amount of time necessary to develop these projects, the Female Offender Program Director, Roz Canter, and this author developed a proposal to hire program development personnel to focus exclusively on these projects. The proposal was submitted to, and accepted by, the U.S. Department of Labor, through the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). Two capable young women ex-offenders were hired: one to develop a women's self-help organization, the other to explore the possibilities of an alternative residential program for women. They were the first ex-offenders to join the YWCA staff.

Prior groundwork had been laid in the community for both projects, and the new staff (neither of whom had ever experienced social work "from the other side") quickly began rallying further community support.

8. Women ex-offenders began to trust the program staff to varying degrees, as they began to see better opportunities for themselves after release. The loan fund, though small, was used repeatedly, with 100% successful payback within the prescribed period. Several women connected on the outside with volunteers they met inside. Though the initial group was small, aftercare training programs and job placements evidenced a higher degree of stability than prior to the program. Women had someone to talk with when things began to go sour. They freely visited the YWCA; even those women who seemed to have disappeared, eventually contacted the aftercare counselor.

We could not confirm any concrete impact on recidivism, but trust was developing between the staff and the women. "There aren't very many other people who care what I do," said one woman.

9. During the first year, the number of women incarcerated on a pretrial basis dropped substantially over the previous year. Arrest rates seemed to remain constant; however, with the Female Offender Program as a new community resource, judges elected to send fewer of them to jail to await trial.

Though the program had no specific "release with services" component, our massive community awareness campaign had apparently touched the courts. Judges had been approached regarding the women's needs, as had the local police departments.

10. When community members were invited to tour the newly renovated women's unit, hundreds of men and women accepted the open invitation. Politicians, judges, police officers, social workers, businessmen and women, lawyers, clergy, club women, housewives, and concerned volunteers welcomed the opportunity to show their support for the overall reform efforts.

Problems

The Female Offender Program was not without its share of problems:

1. The position of Director was originally designed as a part-time responsibility, more to fit our budget to the available funding than any thought-out plan regarding the actual amount of time required to direct the program.

This was a mistake, and for the first year Roz Canter stretched her schedule to accommodate the many demands on her time. Her other responsibilities included leadership of the YWCA's Woman's Center.

Resolution: the position was converted to full time during the second year, more adequately acknowledging the demands of the job.

2. Many volunteers expressed enthusiasm for jail work until they were exposed to the jail itself; their good intentions faded with the realities of the bars and badges. Extensive time was invested with potential volunteers who, after a brief appearance at the jail, disappeared. Though a few dedicated people were recruited, many disappointed us, the jail administrators, and most of all, the women inmates.

Resolution: a tighter screening of volunteers was developed, with training available to determine their motives, attitudes, values, commitment, etc., for working with women inmates.

3. Though the renovations greatly improved the physical setting of the women's unit overall, we lost one major battle in the visiting area. An "isolation booth" kind of visiting room was built, with friends and loved ones talking through a mesh screen. The newly constructed room precluded contact visiting -- an issue the staff considered critical for mother-child relations.

Resolution: program staff negotiated with security officials at the jail to make mother-child contact visits available on an individually determined basis, in another area of the women's unit.

4. A philosophical split developed within the Female Offender Program staff, along the lines of traditional helper vs. radical ally. Issues developed where the differing perspectives became apparent: tightly structuring the day vs. assisting each woman to decide for herself what she wanted to do; imposing separation between inmates and staff through formal Mrs., Ms. names for staff, vs. an egalitarian first-name basis for both groups. The approach to treatment became inconsistent, and staff tension periodically erupted.

Resolution: this problem has not yet been resolved. The program director is taking a more active role in program decision making, working with jail administrators to develop more humanitarian policies.

5. The Female Offender Program staff "did all the work for change," said Roz Canter. As a result, the program was not as strong a partnership as it had originally been conceived.

Resolution: the collaboration needs ongoing attention, and the YWCA leadership has become more actively involved in relations with the Sheriff. Contacts at this level are helping solidify the reform work of the project director.

6. Relations between the program staff and female correctional officers were tenuous, though not hostile. Threatened power was an issue among both groups.

Resolution: the program's Intake Counselor was appointed supervisor of the women's unit, coordinating both treatment and security activities. Salaries for program staff were raised on a par with correctional officers.

7. Women held on pretrial status were not given the attention originally planned for their long-term needs. Programming focused too heavily on the women incarcerated on a sentenced basis. Pretrial women did not receive equally intense attention.

Resolution: staff are focusing more on the needs of the pretrial women, through the special intake form developed for this group. Community-based programming is developing (including the exploration of an alternative housing facility) and release-with-services work is anticipated.

8. First-year funding was contributed completely from sources outside the county government. Grants for the program were written and solicited by the YWCA, on behalf of the Hampden County Jail.

Resolution: the long-term financial stability of the program depends on the county gradually absorbing costs. During the second year, the county committed themselves to fund one full-time salary, an indication of their more active financial responsibility for women's services.

9. First-year LEAA funding had been granted from the Special Discretionary Funds, with women offenders listed as a priority group. During the second year, guidelines had omitted women as a special offender group.

Resolution: lobbying at the federal level took place by regional LEAA officials, on behalf of the Female Offender Program. Provision was also made to fund the program through state block grant monies, when it became apparent that the Discretionary Funds would not be available.

10. As staff became involved with the magnitude of female offender issues, they became overwhelmed with the scope of services and reform needed. The program staff couldn't tackle it all at once.

Resolution: converting the position of director from part time to full time should facilitate more long-range planning. Hiring additional staff through other grants will also supplement the director's efforts.

Funding and Budgets

The Springfield YWCA has been responsible for developing funding for the Female Offender Program. Grants have been obtained from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, as well as private foundations. During the second year of the program, Hampden County contributed 18% of the required 25% local match.

Below is the budget for the first year of the program, to give prospective program developers an idea of the kinds of costs that should be considered.

Fiscal year 1976-77

Salaries	
Project Coordinator (12 hrs. per week)	$ 3,000
Intake Counselor (full time)	9,000
Vocational Counselor (15 hrs. per week)	4,000
Recreational Counselor (15 hrs. per week)	4,000
Advocate Counselor (full time)	9,000
Secretary (7-1/2 hrs. per week)	950
	$29,950
Fringe Benefits (15%)	$ 4,492
Travel	
Use of personal car	200
Use of YWCA van	300
	$ 500
Supplies	
Program supplies, speakers, films, etc.	1,200
Office supplies, intake forms, etc.	350
	$ 1,550
Indirect Charges	
Administration, YWCA, bookkeeping, accounting, audit, promotion	3,846
Outreach overhead at YWCA, telephone, offices, utilities, activity rooms, gymnasium, craft & sewing rooms	2,500
	$ 6,346
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS:	$42,838
Program Income:	
LEAA	$36,442
Local foundation grants	8,742
	$45,184

The balance of the funds were used for special, unexpected costs, such as training, conferences, office furniture, extraordinary travel, etc.

Recommendations

Reform in the criminal justice system is often a tedious process, and many allies of jailed women get bogged down in program-specific problems. In an effort to share broader insights, the Female Offender Program staff have contributed the following recommendations for other new programs to consider:

1. Politicize from the beginning. Involve the local power structure (Chamber of Commerce, Council of Churches, women's groups, offender support systems) in your reform efforts. Develop a strong, sensitive community of caring allies, and raise the overall community consciousness.

2. Regionalize your efforts. Share your insights, plans, and resources with reformers in neighboring counties. Broaden your collective strength with centralized, consistent perspectives for change.

3. Screen your prospective staff and volunteers philosophically, and deemphasize the importance of traditional credentials. Find out what each person feels about the existing criminal laws, why they think the women are "criminals," how closely they relate to the women's problems. Weed out those who do not share your philosophical perspective, no matter how good they look in their resumes.

4. Hire women ex-offenders. Show your egalitarianism directly.

5. Train staff and volunteers with role playing sessions with women ex-offenders as the trainers. Reality test the relational skills of the new staff. Involve ex-offenders directly in your reform efforts.

6. Stimulate the arrest, booking, incarceration process. Give new staff a chance to feel the tension, humiliation, powerlessness firsthand.

7. Develop healthy court and police relations from the beginning. Let them know your position, and that you are a resource, not just an adversary. Solicit their support for deinstitutionalization of women offenders.

8. Recognize that criminal behavior is more a result of social conditions than individual deficiency or depravity. Enlist the support of the local media to introduce this idea to the community through sensitive journalism.

9. Examine the elective process of the local sheriff. The political nature of the job demands community support. Work for the election of those who espouse more humane, equitable treatment of women offenders by the criminal justice system.

10. Investigate alternative ways of dealing with victimless crimes, particularly prostitution and drug offenses. Work with local police and the courts to develop outpatient services, community residences, volunteer support networks. Support decriminalization legislation.

11. Use the legal system for reform. Work with women offenders to file class action suits in those communities that will not change without the heavy hand of the law. Involve women lawyers and women judges in the legal process.

12. Follow the progress of halfway houses and community residential facilities for all categories of clients: mentally retarded, alcoholics, the blind, etc. Monitor the position of your local city council on approving or rejecting such facilities. Their progress is closely tied with efforts to open a community residential facility (as an alternative to jail) for women offenders.

13. Consider developing a halfway house for a mixed population of women: women who have been sentenced, women on pretrial status, women who are on parole or probation, women who have been battered, in an effort to destigmatize the facility. Empower a collective women's center.

14. Avoid establishing program plans that categorize. Women offenders are infinitely variable; the "average" offender does not exist. Programs must be individualized if they are to be effective.

15. Recognize that most women offenders are mothers, and their children are a primary concern. Involve agencies that focus on children in your reform efforts. Work to solidify the mother-child relationship, not to further undermine it. Invite children to the jail often; set up relaxed visiting rules; offer workshops on effective parenting; follow the children placed in foster care; set up facilities that allow children to be housed with their mothers.

16. Work with the total jail system, not just the women's unit, to develop coed classes and programs. Recognize that the women's unit of the jail may be a bellwether for the whole institution.

17. Don't be afraid to gamble. Imaginative people are needed who can plunge in and try something new.

18. Involve your local community in fund raising, including churches, women's clubs, and the local business community. Balance federal and state grants with local contributions, to provide a buffer against changing federal guidelines.

19. When your local reform efforts seem to stall, contact people in other communities who have been through it before. You'll find supportive allies across the country listed as resources in this book. Remember that the work in one community impacts another, and that together we can make the criminal justice system more than just ice.

4. Resources

Organizations across the country working on behalf of women offenders and criminal justice reform.

A

Action for Forgotten Women
1601 Sedgefield St., Apt. E
Durham, North Carolina 27705

Adult Female Residence at Pella
711 East Locust
Des Moines, Iowa 50314

Alabama Committee for Community-Based Corrections for Women
Catholic Social Services
404 Government St., Box 759
Mobile, Alabama 36601

Alameda County-Santa Rita Community Reentry Inmate Services Program
1221 Oak Street
Oakland, California 94612

The Aid Center
Box E 646
New Bedford, Massachusetts 02742

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
Offender Assistance Program
One Dupont Circle, Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Association of Law Libraries
Committee on Law Library Service to Prisoners
53 West Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois 60604

American Bar Association
Bar Association Support to Improve Correctional Services
Clearinghouse for Offender Literacy Programs
Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions
Information Exchange
National Offender Services Coordination Program
Pretrial Intervention Service Ctr.
1800 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Bar Association
Female Offender Resource Center
c/o The Center for Women Policy Studies
2000 P Street, N.W., Suite 508
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Bar Association
Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services
1705 DeSalles, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Civil Liberties Union
National Prison Project
1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 1031
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Correctional Association
Mutual Agreement Programming (Room 212)
Parole-Corrections Project (Suite L-208)
Project READ (Suite 306)
4321 Hartwick Road
College Park, Maryland 20740

American Correctional Association
National Offender Services CONtact Ctr.
P.O. Box 81826
Lincoln, Nebraska 68501

The American Foundation
Institute of Corrections
1532 Philadelphia National Bank Bldg.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

American Friends Service Committee
Administration of Justice Programs
160 North 15th Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

American Friends Service Committee
Middle Atlantic Region
319 East 25th Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

American Friends Service Committee
Mother's in Prison Project
407 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60605

American Friends Service Committee
Northwest Indiana Area Office
8 North Washington Street
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383

American Friends Service Committee
Washington Pretrial Justice Program
1800 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

American Justice Institute
1007 - 7th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

American Justice Institute
Correctional Economics Center
901 North Washington Street
Suite 609
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

American Library Association
Women's Reference and Adult Services Division
c/o Helen Josephine
1032 Cragmont Avenue
Berkeley, California 94708

American Lutheran Church
Liaison to the Criminal Justice System
Reach Out to Women in Prison Programs
422 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

American Red Cross
222 South Cherry Avenue
Tucson, Arizona 85719

American Red Cross
150 Amsterdam Avenue
New York, New York 10000

American Red Cross
National Headquarters
Washington, D.C. 20006

Amicus, Inc.
1140 Plymouth Bldg.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

Art Without Walls
c/o Marilyn Adams
32 East 169th Street
Bronx, New York 10452

Association of Junior Leagues, Inc.
Project IMPACT
825 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Association of Programs for Female Offenders
c/o Asst. to Comm. for Special Programs
1543 Brockwall Drive
Columbia, South Carolina 29206

Atkins House
307 East King Street
York, Pennsylvania

B

Barristers' Jail Study Committee
Los Angeles Country Bar Association
606 South Olive Street, Suite 1212
Los Angeles, California 90014

Bay Area Committee for Women Offenders
c/o Kay Nollenberger
1541 Oxford, #207
Berkeley, California 95116

Benedict Center for Criminal Justice
(including Wisconsin Program for Women and Girl Offenders)
1015 North Ninth Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Bergen County Pretrial Intervention Program
123 Hudson Street
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

Berks County Prison Society, Inc.
532 Washington Street
Reading, Pennsylvania 19602

Boston Women's Collective
Women's Yellow Pages
Park Square Building, 203B
Boston, Massachusetts 02116

Bucks County Dept. of Corrections
Assoc. for Corrections &
Rehabilitation
138 South Pine Street
Doylestown, Pennsylvania 18901

Buffalo Women's Prison Project
P.O. Box 87, O'Brian Hall
SUNY-Buffalo, North Campus
Buffalo, New York 14260

C

Camden County Pretrial Intervention
Program
327 Market Street, Box 1928
Camden, New Jersey 08102

Central Piedmont Community College
Offender Program
Elizabeth Avenue at Kings Drive
P.O. Box 4009
Charlotte, North Carolina 28204

Church Women United
475 Riverside Drive
P.O. Box 134, Manhattanville Sta.
New York, New York 10027

Citizen and Offender Programs in
Education
1015 North 9th Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

City and County of Denver
People Who Care Program
City & County Building
Denver, Colorado 80202

CIVIL LIBERTIES REVIEW
22 East 40th Street, Room 1020
New York, New York 10016

Colorado Coalition of Women in
Criminal Justice
1545 Fremont Place
Denver, Colorado 08202

COMMITTEE FOR PRISON HUMANITY AND
JUSTICE NEWSLETTER
1029 4th Street
San Rafael, California 94901

Community Analysis Division
140 West Flagler Street, 11th Floor
Miami, Florida 33130

Community College of Denver
Auraria Campus
1111 West Colfax Street
Denver, Colorado 80204

Community Corrections
505 East 13th Street, 5th Floor
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Community Ex-Offender Project
P.O. Box 3098, Station D
San Jose, California 95116

Contra Costa County
Bay Area Quest Program
Country Administration Building
Martinez, California 94553

Cook County Jail--Women's Division
2900 South California Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60608

Co-Workers Development Corporation
50 Court Street
Brooklyn, New York 11213

COYOTE (Call Off Your Old Tired
Ethics)
P.O. Box 26354
San Francisco, California 94126

Criminal Justice Reform for Women
c/o Delano Lewis
C & P Telephone Co., Room 600
719 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

D

Dallas County Educational/Rehabili-
tation Program
El Centro Community College
Main & Lamar Streets
Dallas, Texas 75202

Dallas County Jail
600 Commerce Street
Dallas, Texas 75202

Delaware County
Regional Women's Prison
Media, Pennsylvania 19063

Denver County Jail
10500 Smith Road
Denver, Colorado 80200

"Des Moines Project"
Fifth Judicial District Department
of Court Services
1000 College Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50314

Detroit House of Corrections
Job Training Program
Box 174, City Hall
Plymouth, Michigan 48170

District of Columbia Commission on
the Status of Women
Room 204, District Building
14th and E Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

E

Elizabeth Fry Center
3429 West Olympic Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90019

Entropy Limited
214 Tennyson Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Erie County Holding Center
10 Delaware Avenue
Buffalo, New York 14202

F

Fairfield House
515 Victoria Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32202

Family and Children's Service
Women's Discussion Group Program
414 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404

Federal Jail Inspection Service
Community Services Liaison
104 LC Building
Washington, D.C. 20537

Female Offenders Program of
Western Pennsylvania, Inc.
906 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Floating Foundation of Photography
West 79th Street Boat Basin
New York, New York 10000

Florida Clearinghouse on Criminal
Justice
222 West Pensacola Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Florida Department of Health and
Rehabilitative Services
1323 Winewood Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Florida Junior College
Offender Answer Program
940 Main Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32202

Fortune Society
Women's Programs
29 East 22nd Street
New York 10010

Friends Suburban Project
P.O. Box 462
Concordville, Pennsylvania 19331

Fresno County Residential Treatment
Program
Fresno County Hall of Records
Fresno, California 93721

Fulton County Adult Offenders
Program
165 Central Avenue, Southwest
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

G

Grady Memorial Hospital
Family Planning Program
Box 26069, 80 Butler Street, S.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Grafton County Jail and House of
Correction
P.O. Box 267
Woodsville, New Hampshire 03785

Green Hope Residence
448 East 119th Street
New York, New York 10035

H

Hampden County Jail and House of Correction
79 York Street
Springfield, Massachusetts 01105

Harvard Prison Legal Assistance Project
Austin Hall
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Help Our Prisoners Exist (HOPE)
Box 24031
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73124

Helping Ex-Prisoners Live Positively (HELP)
56 Union Place
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

Hennepin County Adult Corrections
Women's Section
1245 Shenandoah Lane
Wayzata, Minnesota 55391

Horizon Halfway House for Women
1869 North 25th Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53205

Hudson County Pretrial Intervention Program
30 Baldwin Avenue, 12th Floor
Jersey City, New Jersey 07304

I

Idaho Volunteers in Corrections
409 North 11th Street
Boise, Idaho 83702

Institute for Law & Social Research
1125 15th Street, N.W., Suite 625
Washington, D.C. 20005

International Association of Chiefs of Police
11 Firstfield Road
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760

International Halfway House Assoc.
2525 Victory Parkway
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206

International Liaison for Lay Volunteer Service
39 Lackawanna Place, Room 5
Bloomfield, New Jersey 07003

International Women's Year Secretariat
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20523

J

Jackson County Department of Corrections
Community Corrections Center
415 East 12th
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Joint Religious Legislative Coalition
122 West Franklin
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404

Judicial Advocates for Women
P.O. Box 4155
Seattle, Washington 98104

Junior League of the City of New York
130 East 80th Street
New York, New York 10021

Justice Resource Institute
Diversion of Female Offenders
14 Somerset Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

L

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA)
Information Systems Division
Office of Regional Operations
Grant Program File (PROFILE)
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
National Institute on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
National Criminal Justice Reference Service
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20531

League of Catholic Women of Detroit
Project Transition
100 Parsons Street
Detroit, Michigan 48101

Link Society
P.O. Box 10157
Prichard, Alabama 36610

Literacy Volunteers of America
3001 James Street
Syracuse, New York 13206

Literacy Volunteers of Massachusetts
Worcester Center
Worcester, Massachusetts 01608

Literacy Volunteer Program
Bedford Hills Correctional Facility for Women
247 Harris Road
Bedford Hills, New York 10507

Livingston County Sheriff's Department
Community Re-Entry Program
1503 Highlander Way
Howell, Michigan 48843

Lucas County Sheriff's Department
Women Offenders' Services Bureau
1622 Speilbusch
Toledo, Ohio 43624

M

Marin County Women's Correctional Program
Marin County Board of Supervisors
Civic Center
San Rafael, California 94903

Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union Foundation
Women's Rights Project
68 Devonshire Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Massachusetts Council of Churches
14 Beacon Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Match-Two (M-2) Sponsors, Inc.
799 Fletcher Lane, Suite 103
Hayward, California 94544

Maui County Prevention/Reduction of Crime thru Education & Training Program
County Courthouse
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Mecklenberg County Jail
Room 103, Court House
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

Mennonite Central Committee
21 South 12th Street
Akron, Pennsylvania 17501

Mennonite Central Committee
Peace Section
409 West 11th Street
Newton, Kansas 67114

Miami-Dade Community College
Comprehensive Program of Rehabilitative Education (CPORE)
Division of Community Services
11380 N.W. 27th Avenue
Miami, Florida 33167

Miami-Dade Community College
Women Offenders' Career Development Program
11011 S.W. 104th Street
Miami, Florida 33176

Middlesex County Women's Jail Project
Box 565
Billerica, Massachusetts 01821

Minnesota Department of Corrections
Community Corrections Program for
Women Offenders
430 Metro Square
St. Paul, Minnesota 44101

Minnesota Prisoners' Union
1427 Washington Avenue, South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55405

Minority Women's Caucus
c/o Corina Aragon
8190 Bradburn Drive
Westminster, Colorado 80030

Missouri Coordinating Council for
Female Offenders
University of Missouri
606 Kuhlman Court
Columbia, Missouri 65201

Monroe County Legal Assistance Corp.
80 West Main Street
Rochester, New York 14614

Montana Committee on Women and the
Criminal Justice System
Women's Resource Center
University of Montana
Missoula, Montana 59801

Morris County Pretrial Intervention
Program
Court House
Morristown, New Jersey 07960

Mothers in Prison Project
407 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60605

Multi-Resource Center
1900 Chicago Avenue, South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404

Mutual Agreement Programming (MAP)
for Women
2160 Guilford Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

N

Nassau County Correctional Center
Operation Midway
P.O. Box 172
East Meadow, New York 11554

Nassau County Women's Services
One Old Country Road
Carle Place, New York 11514

National Alliance of Businessmen
Career Motivation Institute
1730 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

National Association of Counties
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

National Association of Women
Helping Offenders
834 North 7th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411

National Association of Women in
Criminal Justice
601 Indiana Avenue, N.W., 2nd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20004

National Clearinghouse for Legal
Services
710 North Lake Shore Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60611

National Conference of State
Criminal Justice Planning
Administration
1909 K Street, N.W., Suite 204
Washington, D.C. 20006

National Council on Crime and
Delinquency
Continental Plaza
411 Hackensack Avenue
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

National Criminal Justice Reference
Service
P.O. Box 24036
Southwest Post Office
Washington, D.C. 20024

National Information Center on
Volunteerism
P.O. Box 1807
Boulder, Colorado 80306

National Jail Center
National Institute of Corrections
Boulder County Justice Center
Boulder, Colorado 80300

National Moratorium on Prison Construction
3106 Mt. Pleasant Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20010

National Prison Project
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1031
Washington, D.C. 20036

National Puerto Rican Forum
Puerto Rican Women's Prison Project
22 East 54th Street
New York, New York 10022

National Sheriff's Association
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

National Study of Women's Correctional Programs
California Department of Youth Authority
714 P Street
Sacramento, California 95818

New England Prisoners' Association
116 School Street
Waltham, Massachusetts 02154

Newgate Education & Research Center
430 Oak Grove, Suite B-12
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403

New York Junior League
130 East 80th Street
New York, New York 10021

North Carolina Prisoners' Labor Union
Box 2842
Durham, North Carolina 27705

Northern Illinois Federation for Offenders
c/o Winnebago County Jail
Rockford, Illinois 61071

O

Oakland County Jail
Corrective Guidance Program
1201 North Telegraph Road
Pontiac, Michigan 48053

Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR) of New York City, Inc.
491 Hudson Street
New York, New York 10014

Offender Aid and Restoration
The Mosque, Room 304
Laurel and Main Streets
Richmond, Virginia 23320

Offender Family Crisis Intervention Program
2410 Tampa Street
Tampa, Florida 33601

Office of the Public Defender
15th Judicial Circuit
10th Floor, Comeau Building
319 Clematis Street
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

OFF OUR BACKS: A WOMEN'S NEWS JOURNAL
1724 20th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

Office of Volunteers
615 North St. Asceph Street
Alexandria, Virginia 23314

Oklahoma Prisoners' Union
Box 25154
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73103

Orange County Jail
Women's Pretrial Release Program
Correctional Programs Section
1 North Court Street
Orlando, Florida 32801

P

Palm Beach County Jail
542 1st Street, P.O. Box 670
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

Paulist Center
Committee for Correctional Reform
5 Park Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Pennsylvania Governor's Justice Commission
Pennsylvania Department of Justice
P.O. Box 1167, Federal Square Sta.
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17108

Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders
(archives at: Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122)

Pi House, Inc.
Community Correction Center for Women
581 Portland Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55100

Pretrial Intervention Program
Administrative Office of the Courts
State House Annex
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Pretrial Services Resource Center
1010 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20005

Prison Families Anonymous
131 Jackson Street
Hempstead, Long Island, New York 11550

PRISON LAW REPORTER
15th Floor, Hoge Building
Seattle, Washington 98104

Prison Research Education Action Project (PREAP)
3049 East Genessee Street
Syracuse, New York 13224

Prison & Community Together, Inc.
539 Cole Court
Michigan City, Indiana 46360

PRISONERS FREE PRESS
Box 4731
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19134

Prisoners' Rights Project
Legal Aid Society
15 Park Row, 19th Floor
New York, New York 10038

Prisoners' Union
1315 18th Street
San Francisco, California 94107

Prisoners Visitation and Support Committee
Suite 300, 2016 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Project Phoenix
1410 North 27th Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53208

Prostitutes Union of Massachusetts (PUMA)
P.O. Box 211
Boston, Massachusetts 02101

R

Radical Clearinghouse
Room 293, Illinois Union
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Rehabilitation Research Foundation
P.O. Box 3587
Montgomery, Alabama 36109

Resources for Community Change
P.O. Box 21066
Washington, D.C. 20009

S

San Francisco Women's Resource Program
Room 333, City Hall
San Francisco, California 94102

San Francisco Prisoners' Health Project
Building 70, Room 429
San Francisco General Hospital
San Francisco, California 94110

San Mateo County
Community Rehabilitation House for Adult Female Offenders
County Government Center
Redwood City, California 94063

Seventh Step Foundation
Box 635
Topeka, Kansas 66601

Sojourner Residence
411 Seventh Street
West Palm Beach, Florida 33400

Southern Poverty Law Center
1001 South Hull Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36101

Spokane County Jail
Work Release Program
1100 West Mallon Street
Spokane, Washington 99201

Star of the North Jaycees
Box 55
Stillwater, Minnesota 55082

State Fair Community College
Nurse's Aide Training Program
for Adult Female Felons
1900 Clarendon Road
Sedalia, Missouri 65301

Step-Up Program
Suite 203, JANAF Exec. Center
Janaf Shopping Center
Norfolk, Virginia 23502

Still Doing Time
4545 South Drexel Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois 60653

Sybil Brand Institute
Los Angeles, California

T

Talbert House
334 McGregor Avenue
Cincinnati, Ohio 45219

Task Force on Women Employers and
Women Offenders
P.O. Box 766
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Task Force on Women Offenders in
Maryland
1002 Mondamin Concourse
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

Texas Jail and Prison Coalition
1701 East 19th Street
Austin, Texas 78702

Thresholds
Correctional Solutions, Inc.
22 Ellsworth Avenue
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Today Not Tomorrow (TNT)
85 Colberg Avenue
Roslindale, Massachusetts 02131

U

Unitarian Universalist Service
Committee
c/o Sandy Carruthers
1545 Tremont Place
Denver, Colorado 80200

United Methodist Church
Board of Christian Social Concerns
Department of Law, Justice and
Community Relations
100 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

United States Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

U.S. Bureau of Prisons
Staff Training Center
523 McDonough Blvd.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

University of Alabama
Psychology Department
Box 2968
University, Alabama 35486

University of Wisconsin
Research and Training Center
Department of Rehabilitation and
Manpower Services
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

Utah State Prison
Women's Volunteer Project
P.O. Box 250
Draper, Utah 84020

V

Vera Institute of Justice
30 East 39th Street
New York, New York 10016

Visitors Services Center
1422 Massachusetts Ave., S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

Vocare
2849 Delaware Street
Oakland, California 94607

Vocational Rehabilitation for Women Inmates
160 Old Country Road
Mineola, New York 11501

Volunteers in Prevention, Prosecution, Probation, Prison, Parole (VIP)
200 Washington Square Plaza
Royal Oak, Michigan 48067

Volunteers in Probation
P.O. Box 94652
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

W

Washington County Sheriff's Office
Female Offender Programs
Courthouse
Fayetteville, Arizona 72701

Washington Half-Way Home for Women
1816 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

Wayne County
Project Transition
1220 City-Co Building
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Western Moratorium on Prison Construction
Unitarian Universalist Service Comm.
1251 Second Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

Wider Opportunities for Women
1649 K Street, 4th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20006

Wisconsin Prisoners' Union
953 Jennifer Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53403

Woman-to-Woman (W-2)
935 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43205

WOMAN, Inc.
4105 Cass Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48201

Women Against Prison
520 Walnut, Apt. 2
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Women in Action
Criminal Justice Division/
Jail Committee
625 West Alabama, #4
Houston, Texas 77006

Women, Inc.
570 Warren Street
Dorchester, Massachusetts 02121

Women Offender Task Force
316 North Michigan Street
Toledo, Ohio 43624

Women Offenders Project
Whatcom County Courthouse
Bellingham, Washington

Women Out Now Prison Project
Box 22199
Seattle, Washington 98122

Women's Bureau
U.S. Department of Labor
Employment Standards Administration
Washington, D.C. 20210

Women's Detention Center
1010 North Capital Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Women's Detention Center
1145 N.W. 11th Street
Miami, Florida 33125

Women's Detention Center
PACE Program for Women
2900 South California
Chicago, Illinois 60608

Women's Educational Resource Ctr.
Center for Inner City Studies
Northeastern Illinois University
4545 South Drexel Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois 60653

Women's Jail Project
558 Capp Street
San Francisco, California 94110

Women's Jail Project
101 Plymouth Avenue, South
Rochester, New York 14608

Women's Jail Study Group
c/o Atty. Mary Vail
641 3rd Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

Women's Justice Forum, Inc.
Womanpower Project
818 19th Street (upstairs)
Sacramento, California 95814

Women's Litigation Unit
Neighborhood Legal Services
1095 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94103

Women's Prison Association and
Hopper Home
110 Second Avenue
New York, New York 10003

Women's Prison Project
121 Fitzhugh Street, North
Rochester, New York 14614

Women's Residential Facility
Des Moines Project
3118 Cottage Grove
Des Moines, Iowa 50311

Women's Resource Center, Inc.
706 N. Franklin Street, Suite 605
Tampa, Florida 33602

Women's Yellow Pages
Boston Women's Collective, Inc.
490 Beacon Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

Y

Yakima County
Alcohol Related Adult Offender
Rehabilitation Project
Yakima, Washington 98901

Youth for Christ International
P.O. Box 419
Wheaton, Illinois 60187

YWCA
Career Readiness Program
321 North Pomona
Fullerton, California 92632

YWCA
Pasadena Foothill Valley Reentry
Program
Pasadena Community Services
Commission
812-814 North Fair Oaks Avenue
Pasadena, California 91103

YWCA
48 Howe Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

YWCA
Women Offenders Recreation Program
87 Spring Street
Portland, Maine 04111

YWCA
2 Washington Street
Worcester, Massachusetts 01608

YWCA
Female Offender Program
26 Howard Street
Springfield, Massachusetts 01105

YWCA
The Miriam Center
2016 Cass Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68102

YWCA
795 Main Street
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

YWCA
Intervention Program
190 Franklin Street
Buffalo, New York 14202

YWCA
National Board
600 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10022

YWCA
National Intervention Program
111 Fifth Avenue, 13th Floor
New York, New York 10003

YWCA
Women's Justice Program
175 North Clinton Avenue
Rochester, New York 14604

YWCA
Women Offender Program
69 North Broadway
White Plains, New York 10603

YWCA
Ninth & Walnut Streets
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

YWCA
Women's Prison Project
1111 S.W. Tenth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97205

YWCA
8th & Washington Streets
Reading, Pennsylvania 19601

YWCA
401 North Carancahua
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401

YWCA
318 McCullough Street
San Antonio, Texas 78215

YWCA
322 East Third Street, South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

YWCA
Women Offender Program
Bellingham, Washington 98225

YWCA
Women's Community Center
1118 5th Avenue, 3rd Floor
Seattle, Washington 98101

YWCA
W. 829 Broadway
Spokane, Washington 99204

5. Bibliography

Adler, Freda. *Sisters in Crimo: The Rise of the New Female Criminal.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Annual Statistical Report, 1975. Huntsville, Tex.: Research and Development Division, Treatment Directorate, Texas Department of Corrections, 1976.

Arditi, Ralph R., et al. "The Sexual Segregation of American Prisons," *The Mental Health Digest,* Vol. 5, No. 9, September 1973. (Washington, D.C.)

Armore, John R., and Wolfe, Joseph D. *Dictionary of Desperation.* Washington, D.C.: Ex-Offender Employment Program, National Alliance of Businessmen, 1976.

Aron, Nan. "Court Challenges and Legislative Approaches to Prostitution Laws." Paper presented at Biennial Conference, American Civil Liberties Union, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn., June 10-13, 1976.

Baunach, Phyllis Jo, and Marton, Tomas O. "Women in Prison: An Awakening Minority," *Crime and Corrections: Journal of the California Probation Parole and Correctional Association,* Vol. 1, No. 2, Fall 1973. (Sacramento, Calif.)

Beaudin, Bruce. *How to Implement Criminal Justice Standards for Pretrial Release.* Washington, D.C.: Section of Criminal Justice, American Bar Association, 1975.

Beckman, Marlene, Chairperson. *The Report of the LEAA Task Force on Women.* Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, October 1, 1975.

Bergguist, Virginia A. "Women's Participation in Labor Organization," *Monthly Labor Review,* October 1974. (Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.)

Bertrand, Marie-Andree. *Self-Image and Social Representations of Female Offenders: A Contribution to the Study of Women's Image in Some Societies.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of California, University Microfilms, 1967.

Boylos, W. R., et al. *A Survey of Alabama Jails.* Montgomery, Ala.: Aurburn University, May 1975.

Brecher, Edward M., et al. *Health Care in Correctional Institutions.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, September 1975.

Brewer, Kathleen, et al. *Prison Nursery Study: A Summary Report of Findings to Date.* New York: Junior League of the City of New York, 130 East 80th Street, August 1974.

"Brief on the Woman Offender," *Canadian Journal of Corrections*, Vol. 11, No. 1, January 1969. (Canadian Criminology and Corrections Association, Ottawa, Canada)

Brodsky, Annette M., ed. *The Female Offender*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1975.

Brodsky, Annette, et al. *Sexual Justice: Research on Female Offenders*. Tuscaloosa, Ala.: Center for Correctional Psychology, Department of Psychology, University of Alabama, January 1974.

Buckley, Marie. *Breaking into Prison: A Citizen Guide to Volunteer Action*. Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1974.

Bundy, Mary Lee, et al. *The National Prison Directory: Organizational Profiles of Prison Reform Groups in the U.S.* College Park, Md.: Urban Information Interpreters, April 1976.

Burkhart, Kathryn. *Women in Prison*. New York: Doubleday, 1973.

Careers for Women in the 70s. Washington D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1973.

Case, John D., et al. "Correctional Volunteers in Bucks County," *The American Journal of Correction*, January-February 1973. (College Park, Md.)

Chandler, Edna Walker. *Women in Prison*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1973.

Children of Women Offenders Report: 1974-75. New York: Junior League of the City of New York, 130 East 80th Street, 1975.

Clark, Ramsay. *Crime in America: Observations on Its Nature, Causes, Prevention and Control*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970.

"Class Action Challenges Conditions and Practices in D.C. Women's Detention Center," *The Prison Law Reporter*, Vol. 1, No. 6, March 1972. (American Bar Association, Seattle, Wash.)

Community Programs for Women Offenders: Cost and Economic Considerations. Washington, D.C.: Correctional Economics Center, American Bar Association, June 1975.

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973: How Women and Women's Groups Can Help. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, October 1974.

Continuing Education for Women: Current Developments. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1974.

Continuing Education Programs and Services for Women. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1971.

"County Jail Survey," *Liberty to the Captives.* Newton, Kans.: Mennonite Central Committee Peace Section, 409 West 11th St., January 1, 1973.

Crisman, Nancy. *Female Offenders.* New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1976.

Crites, Laura. *The Female Offender.* Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., Lexington Books, 1976.

A Critique of Minimum Standards for County Jails. Boston, Mass.: Strategy and Action Commission, Mass. Council of Churches, July 1975.

Cox, W. R. *Treatment of Women and Girls in Custody.* London: Home Office Prison Department, 1970.

"Crimes by Women Are on the Rise All Over the World," *U.S. News & World Report,* December 22, 1975.

Davis, Angela Y. *If They Come in the Morning: Voices of Resistance.* New York: The Third Press, Joseph Okpaku Publishing Co., 1971.

de Beaumont, Gustave and de Toqueville, Alexis. *On the Penitentiary System in the United States and Its Application in France.* Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard, 1833.

Deming, Vinton, et al. *The County Jail--A Handbook for Citizen Action.* 4th printing. Concordville, Penn.: Friends Suburban Project, September 1976.

Descriptive Profiles on Selected Pretrial Criminal Justice Intervention Programs. Washington, D.C.: Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, National Pretrial Intervention Service Center, American Bar Association, April 1974.

Devivo, Paul, and Devivo, Sandy. "Help for the Woman Breadwinner," *Manpower,* Vol. 5, No. 2, February 1973. (Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.)

"Don't Criticize, Organize," *The Outlaw: Journal of the Prisoners' Union,* Vol. 5, No. 1, January-February 1976. (1315 18th Street, San Francisco, Calif.)

Driver, G. R., et al. *The Babylonian Laws,* Volumes I & II. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955.

DuBose, J. Harvey. *First Grade to College: Information Report of the Division of Educational Services.* Columbia, S.C.: Department of Corrections, 1975.

The Earnings Gap Between Women and Men. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1976.

Education in Establishments for Women and Girls. Policy Statement 5. Maidstone, England: Home Office Prison Department, H.M. Prison, 1972.

Epp, Edgar, and Epp, Leola, eds. *Release* (offender ministries newsletter). (Box 138, RR #4, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7K 3J7)

Facts on Women Workers of Minority Races. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, May 1975.

Pautsko, Timothy F., et al. *Volunteer Programs in Prevention and Diversion.* Boulder, Colo.: National Information Center on Volunteerism, 1973.

Federal Bureau of Prisons 1975. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice, 1975.

Female Offenders: Problems and Programs. Female Offender Resource Center, National Offender Services Coordination Program, American Bar Association, April 1976.

Final Report: Contra Costa County Female Offender Study. San Francisco: Bay Area Quest Program, June 1976.

Fiscal Year 74/75, Operational Plan for Family Planning Program. Tallahassee, Fla.: Department of Health and Rehabilitation Services, Florida Division of Corrections, July 1974.

Fish, Lillian V. *New Trends in Women's Vocational Training.* Presentation at the 85th Congress of the American Correctional Association, Boston, Mass., 1965.

Five-Month Interim Evaluation of VOCARE for Alameda County. Oakland, Calif.: Office of Criminal Justice Planning, Alameda Regional Criminal Justice Planning Board, April 1974.

Flynn, Edith Elisabeth. "Jails and Criminal Justice," *Prisoners in America.* Edited by Lloyd E. Ohlin. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Flynn, Edith Elisabeth. "The Special Problems of Female Offenders; New Directions in Corrections," *We Hold These Truths,* December 5-8, 1971. (National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Washington, D.C.)

Forer, Lois G. *No One Will Lissen.* New York: Grossett & Dunlap, 1970.

Foster, Euphesenia. *Female Offenders in the Federal Correctional System.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice, 1975.

French, Laurence, et al. *Incarceration as a Mechanism of Social Discrimination.* Cullowhee, N.C.: Western Carolina University, 1974.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique.* New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1963.

Gahagan, Lawrence E. *Vocational and Academic Training in Women's Institutions.* Presentation at the 95th Congress of the American Correctional Association, Boston, Mass., 1965.

Get Credit for What You Know. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, January 1974.

Glick, Ruth M., et al. *National Study of Women's Correctional Programs.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, 1976.

Goldfarb, Ronald. *Jails: The Ultimate Ghetto.* New York: Anchor Press/ Doubleday, 1975.

Grogan, Ann. *Women Locked Up: Feminist Perspectives and Alternatives.* Keynote address Delivered at a Conference on Women in Prison, held at the First Universalist Church, Denver, Colorado, January 18, 1975.

A Guide to Sources of Data on Women and Women Workers for the United States and for Regions, States and Local Areas. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1972.

Haft, Marilyn G. "Women in Prison: Discriminatory Practices and Some Legal Solutions," *Clearinghouse Review,* Vol. 8, May 1974. (National Clearinghouse for Legal Services, Chicago, Ill.)

Harris, Janet. *Crisis in Corrections: The Prison Problem.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.

Harris, John D. *The Junkie Priest, Father Daniel Egan, S.A.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964.

Hayes, Norman. "Lady in a Cage" (reprinted from *Philly Talk Magazine,* December 1974). Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders, January 1975.

Hecht, Judith A. *Effects of Halfway Houses on Neighborhood Crime Rates and Property Values: A Preliminary Survey.* Research Report No. 37. Washington, D.C.: Department of Corrections, District of Columbia, November 1970.

Help Improve Vocational Education for Women and Girls in Your Community. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, December 1971.

Hendrick, Grant H. "When Television Is a School for Criminals," *TV Guide,* January 29-February 4, 1977. (Triangle Publications, Radnor, Penn.)

Hendrix, Omar. *A Study in Neglect: A Report on Women Prisoners, July 15, 1972.* New York: The Women's Prison Association, 110 Second Ave., 1972.

Herman, Michele G., and Haft, Marilyn G., eds. *Prisoners' Rights Sourcebook: Theory, Litigation, Practice.* New York: Clark Boardman Co., Ltd., 1973.

Hersey, Paul, et al. *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Hibbert, Christopher. *The Roots of Evil: A Social History of Crime and Punishment.* New York: Minerva Press, 1963.

Highlights of Women's Employment and Education. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, May 1975.

Hortenstine, Virgie. "The Nicest Jail I've Ever Been In," *Fellowship,* May 1968. (Fellowship Publications, Box 271, Nyack, N.Y.)

Hovey, Marcia. "The Forgotten Offenders," *Manpower,* Vol. 3, No. 1, January 1971.

How You Can Help Reduce Barriers to the Employment of Mature Women. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Wage and Labor Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, February 1969.

Hunt, James W., et al. *Removing Offender Employment Restrictions: A Handbook on Remedial Legislation and Other Techniques for Alleviating Formal Employment Restrictions Confronting Ex-Offenders.* Washington, D.C.: Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, American Bar Association, March 1976.

Jacobsen, Sally. *How to Measure the Quality of Criminal Justice in Your Community: Story Ideas for Journalists.* Washington, D.C.: Section of Criminal Justice, American Bar Association, 1975.

Jenkins, W. O., et al. *A Postprison Follow-up Evaluative Study of the Alabama Work Release Program.* Montgomery, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, March 1975.

Jetton, Susan. "Jail Rapes Worry Women's Groups," *The Charlotte Observer,* December 19, 1976. (Charlotte, N.C.)

Johnston, Norman. *The Human Cage: A Brief History of Prison Architecture.* New York: Walker and Co., 1973. (The American Foundation)

Jones, Sheryl, et al. *Regional Conference Report on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals for Women.* Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders, June 1975.

Katrin, Susan Ellen. "The Effects on Women Inmates of Facilitation Training Provided Correctional Officers," *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* Vol. 1, No. 1, March 1974. (Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, Calif.)

Katzenelson, Susan. *The Female Defendant in Washington, D.C.* Washington, D.C.: Institute for Law and Social Research, January 1976.

Kelley, Clarence M. *Crime in the United States: 1974 Uniform Crime Reports.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, November 1975.

Kelley, Clarence M. *Crime in the United States: 1975 Uniform Crime Reports.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, August 1976.

Kennedy, Daniel B., and Kerber, August. *Resocialization: An American Experiment.* New York: Behavioral Publications, 1973.

Ketterling, Marvin E. *Rehabilitation of Women in the Milwaukee County Jail: An Exploratory Experiment.* Doctor of Education Thesis, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado, Summer 1964.

Ketterling, Marvin E. "Rehabilitating Women in Jail," *Journal of Rehabilitation* (36), May-June 1970. (National Rehabilitation Association, Washington, D.C.)

King, Mary E. *Working Paper--The Female Offender and Employment.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Commission for the Observance of International Women's Year, U.S. Department of State, October 31, 1975.

Knopp, Fay Honey, et al. "How to Become an Ally of Our Prisoners," *Fellowship,* September 1973. (Fellowship Publications, Box 271, Nyack, N.Y.)

Knopp, Fay Honey, et al. *Instead of Prisons: A Handbook for Abolitionists.* Syracuse, N.Y.: Prison Research Education Action Project, 1976.

Koontz, Elizabeth Duncan. *American Women at the Crossroads: Directions for the Future* (Fiftieth Anniversary Conference). Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, June 1970.

Krause, Katherine. "Denial of Work Release Programs to Women: A Violation of Equal Protection," *Southern California Law Review,* Vol. 47, No. 4, August 1974. (University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.)

Legal Brief (Prostitution Case), Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Suffolk County, *Commonwealth* v. *Diane King* (76-226, 76-229), *Commonwealth* v. *Barbara A. Astrofsky* (76-226), *Commonwealth* v. *Rebecca Jones* (76-331), Appeal from Superior Court, 1976.

Leonard, Betsey. *A Court Action Handbook: A Manual on Court Monitoring and Community Action.* 11th printing. Corcordville, Penn.: Friends Suburban Project, August 1976.

Lieberg and Parker. "Toward Change in Correctional Manpower Services: Mutual Agreement Programming," in *Correctional Treatment of the Offender.* Edited by Albert R. Roberts. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Lewis, Georgina King. *Elizabeth Fry.* London: Headley Brothers, 1909.

Lewis, Yvonne E., and Clement, David E. *Final Evaluation of the Offender Family Crisis Intervention Program Demonstration Project.* Tampa, Fla.: Hospital and Welfare Board, Hillsborough County Division of Welfare, June 1976.

Livesey, Sharon. *Survey of Legal Literature on Women Offenders.* Pittsburgh: Entropy Limited, 1975.

Margolies, Clorinda. *First Impressions in the House of Correction--Women's Wing.* Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders, December 1975.

Maryland Mutual Agreement Programming for Women. Baltimore, Md.: Division of Correction, n.d.

Mattick, Hans W. "The Contemporary Jails of the United States: An Unknown and Neglected Area of Justice," in *Handbook of Criminology.* Edited by Daniel Glaser. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1974.

McArthur, Virginia A. *From Convict to Citizen: Programs for the Woman Offender.* Washington, D.C.: District of Columbia Commission on the Status of Women, June 1974.

McCrea, Tully L., et al. *A Guide to Improved Handling of Misdemeanant Offenders.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, January 1974.

Menninger, Karl. *The Crime of Punishment.* New York: The Viking Press, 1966.

Menz, Frederick E., et al. *Program Evaluation in Rehabilitation Facilities, Monograph 2: A Program Evaluation Strategy for the Assessment and Evaluation Program of the Wisconsin Correctional System.* Menomonie, Wis.: Research and Training Center, University of Wisconsin - Stout, November 1974.

Millett, Kate. *The Prostitution Papers.* New York: Ballantine Books, div. of Random House, 1976.

Minnesota - PI House, Inc., Community Correction Center for Women: A Preliminary Evaluation Report. St. Paul, Minn.: Governor's Commission on Crime Prevention and Control, March 1974.

Mitford, Jessica. *Kind and Usual Punishment: The Prison Business.* New York: Vintage Books, div. of Random House, 1974.

Morris, Joe Alex. *First Offender: A Volunteer Program for Youth in Trouble with the Law.* New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1970.

Morris, Norval, et al. *Proposals for Prison Reform.* New York: Public Affairs Committee, Inc., 381 Park Avenue, South, 1974.

Morrison, Toni. "What the Black Woman Thinks About Women's Lib," *The New York Times Magazine*, August 22, 1971.

Morton, Joann B. "Women Offenders: Fiction and Facts," *American Journal of Correction*, n.d. (Minneapolis, Minn.)

Mutual Agreement Programming: An Overview. College Park, Md.: Parole Corrections Project, American Correctional Association, n.d.

Nagel, William G. *The New Red Barn: A Critical Look at the Modern American Prison.* New York: Walker and Co., 1973. (American Foundation, Inc., Institute of Corrections, Philadelphia, Penn.)

1970 National Jail Census. Washington, D.C.: National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, February 1971.

The Nation's Jails: A Report on the Census of Jails from the 1972 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails. Washington, D.C.: National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, May 1975.

Newfield, Jack. *Bread and Roses, Too.* New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1971.

Off Our Backs: A Women's News Journal. Special Issue: "Women in Prison," Vol. 11, No. 8, April 1972. (Washington, D.C.)

Padfield, Harland, et al. *Stay Where You Were: A Study of Unemployables in Industry.* New York: J. P. Lippincott Co., 1973.

Payak, Bertha J. "Understanding the Female Offender," *Federal Probation*, Vol. XXII, No. 4, December 1963. (Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C.)

Powell, John. *Fully Human, Fully Alive: A New Life Through a New Vision.* Niles, Ill.: Argus Communications, 1976.

Pretrial Justice Quarterly, "Special Issue on Bail in Pennsylvania," Vol. 6, No. 3, Winter 1977. (Pittsburgh, Penn.)

Prisoners and Prisons in Massachusetts. Boston: Massachusetts Council of Churches (publication date unknown, estimated to be about 1970).

Profile of the Female Offender. Research Report No. 23. Huntsville, Tex.: Research and Development Division, Treatment Directorate, Department of Corrections, 1974.

Rans, L., et al. *Demonstration Project: Alternative to Incarceration for the Woman Offender.* Pittsburgh: Entropy Limited, August 1975.

Reckless, Walter C., and Kay, Barbara Ann. *The Female Offender.* Submitted to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Reintegration of the Offender into the Community. Criminal Justice Monograph. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, June 1973.

Report on Corrections. Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1975.

Richmond, Mark S., et al. *New Roles for Jails: Guidelines for Planning.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice, June 1969.

Rosen, Ruth, and Davidson, Sue, eds. *The Maimie Papers.* Old Westbury, N.Y.: The Feminist Press, 1977.

Roy, Marge. *Final Report on the Career Motivation Institute for Women.* Prepared for the National Alliance of Businessmen, YWCA, 26 Howard Street, Springfield, Mass., December 1975.

Ruane, Kathleen. "Women in Prison," *Network Quarterly,* Vol. IV, No. 1, Winter 1976. (Washington, D.C.)

Ruckelshaus, Jill (presiding officer). . . . *To Form a More Perfect Union . . . Justice for American Women.* Report of the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, June 1976.

St. James, Margo. *Coyote Howls,* Vol. 3, No. 2, 1976. (San Francisco, Calif.)

Scheier, Ivan H., et al. *The Church as Volunteer in Courts and Corrections.* Boulder, Colo.: National Information Center on Volunteerism, 1972.

Scott, Edward M., et al. *Criminal Rehabilitation . . . Within and Without the Walls.* Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Seattle Coyote, Winter 1976. (Seattle, Wash.)

Seitor, Richard P., et al. *Halfway Houses.* Phase I Summary Report. Washington, D.C.: National Evaluation Program, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, January 1977.

Selected Issues for Serious Consideration in Planning Services and/or Residences for Women Offenders. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders, 1973.

Sennett, Richard, and Cobb, Jonathan. *The Hidden Injuries of Class.* New York: Vintage Books, div. of Random House, 1972.

Simon, Rita James. *The Contemporary Woman and Crime.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Mental Health, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975.

Simon, Rita James. *Women and Crime.* Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., Lexington Books, 1975.

Smith, Judy. *Women and the Criminal Justice System: Training Seminar Report and Recommendations.* Missoula, Mont.: University of Montana, 1975.

Sparrow, Gerald. *Women Who Murder.* New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1970.

Steggerda, Roger O., et al. *Community-Based Alternatives to Traditional Corrections. The 1973 Evaluation of the Fifth Judicial District Department of Court Services--State of Iowa.* Davis, Calif.: Research Center, National Council on Crime and Deliquency, February 1974.

Sternbach, Jack C. *Final Evaluation Report, PPWGO Services for Women Offenders.* Philadelphia: n.p., March 1974.

Sturgeon, Susan, and Rans, Laurel. *The Woman Offender: A Bibliographic Sourcebook.* Pittsburgh: Entrophy Limited, December 1975.

Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, 1972, Advance Report. Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, 1972.

Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, 1974, Advance Report. Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, March 1976.

Sykes, Gresham M. *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1958.

"A Symposium: Women and the Criminal Law," *The Am... ...l Criminal Law Review,* Vol. 11, No. 2, Winter 1973.

The Use of Allied Health Personnel in Jails. Chicago: American Medical Association, 1976.

The V.I.P. Examiner, Vol. V, No. 3, Summer 1976. (Flint, Mich.)

Velimesis, Margery L. "The Female Offender," *Crime and Delinquency Literature.* Hackensack, N.J.: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, March 1975.

Velimesis, Margery L., et al. *Proposed Pennsylvania Criminal Justice Goals and Standards for Women.* Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders, June 1975.

Velimesis, Margery L. *Women in County Jails and Prisons.* Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders, April 20, 1972.

Waiting in Jail: A Report Based on Interviews with 144 Men and Women Officially Detained in Washington, D.C., on July 15, 1973. Washington, D.C.: Washington Pretrial Justice Program, American Friends Service Committee, June 1974.

Wallack, Walter M., ed. *Correctional Education Today, First Yearbook of the Committee on Education.* The American Prison Association, 1939.

Watkins, John C. *Changing Inmate Behavior.* Warden-Draper Correctional Center, Elmore, Ala. Paper presented at the Interagency Workshop of the Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences, Sam Houston State University, June 1970.

Weintraub, Judith F. "The Delivery of Services to Families of Prisoners," *Federal Probation.* Washington, D.C.: n.p., December 1976.

Wells, Jean A. *Facts About Women's Absenteeism and Labor Turnover.* Washington, D.C.: Wage and Labor Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, August 1969.

Who Are the Working Mothers? Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1972.

Why Women Work. Rev. Ed. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, July 1976.

Williams, Virgil L., et al. *Convicts, Codes and Contraband: The Prison Life of Men and Women.* Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., div. of J. B. Lippincott, 1974.

Wilson, Nancy Koser, et al. "Is Crime a Man's World" Issues in the Exploration of Criminality," *Journal of Criminal Justice,* Vol. 3, Summer 1975. (Pergamon Press, Elmsford, N.Y.)

Winkler, Sharon J., ed. *About Time,* Vol. 1, No. 1, September 1976. (American Bar Association, National Offender Services Coordination Program, Washington, D.C.)

The Woman Offender in Wisconsin Jails: A Survey. Milwaukee, Wis.: The Wisconsin Program for Women and Girl Offenders and the Benedict Center for Criminal Justice, 1975.

Women Behind Bars: An Organizing Tool. Washington, D.C.: Resources for Community Change, P.O. Box 21066 (zip 20009), 1975.

Women in Detention and Statewide Jail Standards. Washington, D.C.: Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, American Bar Association, 1972.

Women Workers Today. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1976.

Wood, Larry F., et al. *Imprisoned Resources--Innovative Techniques in Educating Prison Inmates.* Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, April 1971.

Wooden, Kenneth. *Weeping in the Playtime of Others: America's Incarcerated Children.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

6. A Final Note

Since the inception of this research project, Federal interest in and support for women's programs has declined sharply. Three events should be noted:

1. The 1978 guidelines for LEAA excluded women as a priority group for funding under Discretionary Grants. Women offenders had previously received recognition as a "special offender group."

2. The Female Offender Resource Center dissolved in 1977. This much-needed clearinghouse for women offender programs was hosted by the American Bar Association in Washington. It was the only centralized source of information on women offenders. Though the files have been inherited by the Center for Women's Policy Studies, funds are not available to maintain or update the information.

3. The Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders lost all funding and dissolved in October 1977. PPWGO was one of the oldest programs for women offenders in the country.

Clearly, these events do not forecast a stable future for other women's programs that rely solely on Federal funds. Women's programs must rally volunteer involvement and local support if they are to survive.